

Cottam Solar Project

The Applicant's Response to Procedural Deadline A and Additional Submissions

Prepared by: Lanpro Services
October 2023

PINS Reference: EN010133
Document Reference: EX1/C8.1.10
The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010
Rules 8(1)(c)



Contents

<u>1</u>	<u>INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY</u>	<u>3</u>
1.1	PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT	3
1.2	STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT	3
<u>2</u>	<u>THE APPLICANT'S RESPONSES TO PROCEDURAL DEADLINE A SUBMISSIONS</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>THE APPLICANT'S RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL SUBMISSIONS MADE BY INTERESTED PARTIES</u>	<u>69</u>

Issue Sheet

Report Prepared for: Cottam Solar Project Ltd.

The Applicant's Responses to Additional Submissions

Prepared by:

Name: Gabriel Cooper

Title: Graduate Planner

Approved by:

Name: Beccy Rejzek

Title: Associate Director

Date: October 2023

Revision: 01

1 Introduction and summary

1.1 Purpose of this document

1.1.1 This document provides Cottam Solar Project Limited (the 'Applicant's') response to those Additional Submissions (the 'AS's') and those Procedural Deadline A Submissions (the 'PDA's') which were published by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) across 29 and 30 August 2023, relating to the Development Consent Order Application (the 'Application') for Cottam Solar Project (the 'Scheme').

1.1.2 A total of 23 AS's and 72 PDA Submissions were submitted to the Examining Authority (ExA) by Interested Parties in response to Item 1 of Annex E of the ExA's Rule 6 Letter (dated 10 July 2023) [PD-006].

1.2 Structure of the report

1.2.1 This document provides responses from the Applicant to those matters raised through Additional Submissions and Procedural Deadline A Submissions and is structured as follows:

- Section 2 provides the Applicant's responses to those Procedural Deadline A Submissions.
- Section 3 provides the Applicant's responses to those Additional Submissions made by Interested Parties.

2 The Applicant's Responses to Procedural Deadline A Submissions

West Lindsey District Council [PDA-002] and [PDA-003]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
WLDC-01	Viewpoints	Reasons for suggestions	<p>[PDA-003]</p> <p>"West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) undertook a site visit of Cottam, Gate Burton and West Burton on the 12th and 13th of June 2023. During the site visit, several points of interest around the schemes were taken into account. This note and accompanying drawing provides a summary of these points of interest for the Cottam scheme which may be of use to the Examining Authority when their site visit.</p> <p>The Points of Interest (PoI) are shown on the Cottam access location plan which shows the vehicle access for the construction of the solar panels. Also included as part of this submission is the access to the Cottam cabling routes which, when combined result in 48 accesses along the entirety of the route.</p> <p>An approximate boundary for the Order Limits of the proposed Tillbridge solar farm (shown as an orange border) has also been included to provide context of the proposed developments in relation to the Cottam DCO, particularly with reference to the cabling route between Cottam 1 and Cottam 2."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and considers West Lindsey District Council's suggested Points of Interest to be widely similar to those Viewpoints as proposed by the Applicant within C8.1.3 The Applicant's Procedural Deadline A Response [PDA-001].</p>
WLDC-03	Viewpoints	Suggested locations for site inspections	<p>[PDA-003]</p> <p>"Points of Interest (PoI)</p> <p>This section provides a brief summary of the PoI that were noted during the site visit. These are not listed in any particular order other than working from the northwest of the scheme and ending in the southeast.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes these Points of Interest as suggested by West Lindsey District Council.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pol 1 – Blyton viewpoints into the area which covers the former RAF Blyton area. Access to proposed Cottam 3a along B1205. • Pol 2 – Blyton Park racetrack access. Access to proposed Cottam 3a along B1205. • Pol 3 – Access north of Pilham for construction and use of Pilham Lane for cable construction routes. Pilham Lane is a small lane which has passing points for standard private vehicles. Order Limits suggest a large removal of hedgerows and allow cable crossing. • Pol 4 – cable crossing location east of Aisby. Order Limits suggest a large removal of hedgerows along minor single carriage road with grassy verges. • Pol 5 – construction access into Cottam 2 in from A631 along minor single carriage road with grassy verges. Access also leads to Grangewell Farm and property surrounded by Cottam 2. • Pol 6 – cable construction route between Cottam 1 and Cottam 2, multiple accesses rather than limited accesses along the route with an internal haul road. Considered why multiple accesses are necessary and an internal haul road cannot be used across the cable connection. o Also considered the schemes in connection with proposed Tillbridge application. • Pol 7 – views of site along Middle Street (B1398) down into proposed area for Tillbridge and interaction with Cottam cabling route. • Pol 8 – Willingham Road viewpoint to see several fields by Cottam 1. Stopped on Willingham Road two right angle turns adjacent to one another. Would be difficult to maneuver construction vehicles along this road. • Pol 9 – Willingham by Stow will be impacted by Cottam construction traffic as well as Gate Burton accesses. Site visit considered that the village will be heavily impacted by the two schemes. • Pol 10 – Coates medieval settlement is in the centre of the Order Limits. Includes a Scheduled Monument which would be impacted by the scheme. 	

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pol 11 – Viewpoint overlooking Cottam 1 along Middle Street, just north of the kennels and cattery. Public footpath down into Cottam 1, north of Ingham (ref. Ingh/16/1). Recommend walking the footpath. • Pol 12 – Cable crossing just south of Marton on High Street (A156). Cable crossing will be used for Cottam, Great Burton, West Burton and Tillbridge. Intensification of works in the area if all schemes are in the area at the same time. Alternatively, separate schemes could cause disruption several times meaning Marton and A156 would be impacted multiple times. • Pol 13 – construction access point from Ingham Road east of the River Till (Squire's Bridge). A stopping point to view into fields. • Pol 14 – additional access point and crossing location along Ingham Road. Considered why both accesses are required for construction in close proximity. • Pol 15 – Tillbridge Lane viewpoint southeast of Scampton which provides vantage point over Cottam 1. Parking stop on the corner of Middle Street and Tillbridge Lane. 	

Broxholme Parish Meeting [PDA-004]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
BPM-01	Community Engagement	Ability to be involved with the process	<p>"The Broxholme Solar Group dedicates itself to keeping the Parishioners properly informed and even we struggle to keep up and the lay person is completely swamped by this blizzard of requirements. I cannot keep our Parish in touch with events in any reasonable fashion and help them maintain any valid, authentic engagement with the consultations.</p> <p>We do not have enough time to properly digest the information and asses the implication of the proposals. We are confused and are excluded from the process by this avalanche of information. All the while this rolls forward we must attend work, complete the harvest and care for families.</p> <p>We are disadvantaged.</p> <p>Many of those affected in West Lindsey wanted all these projects to be considered as the one vast project it really represents. This was dismissed as an option yet now the developers are all ready seemingly in unison to go forward as one. It would seem that the Inspectorate is not placing citizen participation in the appropriate prominent position. We urge you to either spread out these consultations to allow proper engagement OR delay all then and address all the West Lindsey projects as the vast enterprise it really is."</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.

Marion and Gate Burton Parish Council [PDA-005]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
MGBPC-01	The Scheme Cumulative Development	Cumulative Assessment	<p>"It is believed that the process and the applications are fundamentally flawed as:</p> <p>The scale and number of these schemes in a short space of time does not enable people to engage with the process;</p> <p>The applications need to be considered together as they are all in West Lindsey District and jointly affect us and the area.</p> <p>Two of the schemes are being proposed by the same developer, Island Green Power, which shows they are joined schemes."</p>	<p>The Applicant respectfully disagrees.</p> <p>Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058]. Cumulative effects assessments for each topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with the NSIPs identified in paragraph 2.5.9 of C6.2.2 ES Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037]. This assessment is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.</p> <p>As a result of the scale of the project, the Scheme is designated as a nationally significant infrastructure project, and the</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>application is being made for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Examining authority has a duty to ensure that local authorities and interested parties are invited to attend examination meetings (Section 88), hearings (Section 91-96), and to make written representations (Section 90) to be considered within the examination of the DCO application.</p> <p>The Cottam Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project are separate Applications.</p>
MGBPC-02	Cumulative Development	Number of NSIPs within Lincolnshire	"Also, these 4 huge proposals are not the only ones in Lincolnshire (there are at least 9 proposed for this county alone). The difference is that these 4 schemes, are all within a few miles of each other!"	<p>The Applicant notes this comment also.</p> <p>Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058]. Cumulative effects assessments for each topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with the NSIPs</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>identified in paragraph 2.5.9 of C6.2.2 ES Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037] (being West Burton Solar Project, Gate Burton Energy Park and Tillbridge Solar). This assessment is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.</p>

Stow Parish Council [PDA-006]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SPC-01	Viewpoints	Suggested locations for site inspections	<p>"We strongly request an examiner visits the following sites:</p> <p>All these locations are within the area of Cottam 1.</p> <p>Green Lane - between Coates Lane and Ingham Road - to see the rural nature of the lane which is used by locals for running, walking and horse-riding, see the flora and fauna visible there (throughout the year), see the proximity of the house on Ingham Road and why it is not appropriate for it to be used as a route for vehicles connected to the project. Although the application has not yet been dealt with by Lincoln County Council, it is currently waiting designation as a Public Bridleway. Not private land.</p> <p>Normanby Road - the 2 right angle bends leading from the centre of Stow village, passing firstly the wall of St Mary's - Stow Minster. To see the potential for damage to this important heritage asset by abnormal loads - specifically the 16 axle vehicle carrying the heaviest load that will be travelling north to turn right at Cotgarth Lane in Willingham. The inappropriate nature of the road (with its right angle bends and proximity to the Churchyard wall and monastery ruins and private residences) for such a vehicle to travel along. Not private land</p> <p>The 'narrows' between Ingham Road (Coates) and Stow Lane (Ingham). This stretch of single carriage road with passing places is totally inappropriate for use by the large volume and size of construction traffic proposed. See the width of the road, its rural nature and the trees and hedgerows in the ditches either side. Not private land. If this road is restricted for traffic use at the same time as Fleets Lane, it will make a very long diversion for those traveling between the affected villages".</p>	The Applicant acknowledges these suggestions as put to the Examining Authority.

Sturton by Stow and Stow Neighbourhood Plan Group [PDA-008]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SSSPC-01	Viewpoints	Suggested locations for site inspections	<p>"Sturton by Stow and Stow NP Group request that you pay particular attention to the area of St Mary's at Stow. This scheduled monument has been noted as being vulnerable to damage by traffic movement due to the expected sizing of the loads and vehicles.</p> <p>The NP planning group also ask you inspect the banks of the River Till from Thorpe Bridge through to Normanby. This area has been put forward to create wetland mitigation and could easily incorporate a footpath along its length. You will require permission for access along the banks from the affected landowner(s). No doubt IGP can furnish the contact details"</p>	The Applicant acknowledges these suggestions as put to the Examining Authority.

7000 Acres [PDA-010] & [PDA-011]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
7A-01	Preliminary Meeting	Agenda Items	[PDA-010] "The 7000 Acres Group write to submit the following issues in relation to the agenda items for the Preliminary Meeting 5th September 2023 as requested in the Examining Authority's rule 6 letter, dated 10th July 2023."	The Applicant notes the party's full submission, which has not been duplicated here in verbatim, and the comments made on Agenda Items 2, 4 and 6.
7A-02	Viewpoints	Suggested locations for site inspections	[PDA-011] "A suggested Site Inspection location would be from elevated positions on the B1398 (Middle Street) from Hemswell to North Carlton. The Cottam Project will dominate views in an AGLV. Nothing can mitigate 4.5m high panels and the cumulative impact of the other 3 projects all in the same locality"	The Applicant acknowledges this suggestion. The Applicant confirms that, through C8.1.3 The Applicant's Procedural Deadline A Response [PDA-001] , Suggestion 5 (VP30: Cottam 1 North) and Suggestion 6 (VP01: Cottam 1 South) are located on the B1398 and fall between Hemswell and North Carlton.

Tracy Adderley [PDA-012]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
TA-01	The Scheme Cumulative Developments	Naming of the Schemes	"The above aspects are confusing in their own right, but it is made worse by one of the projects being named West Burton Solar Project and another developer branding their proposal as Gate Burton Energy Park. This use of similar names only adds to the confusion. It is easy to see that with these proposals running at roughly the same time, confusion could prevent opposition and cause the general public to lose track of where each one is in the process."	The Applicant notes this comment.
TA-02	Cumulative Development	Number of NSIPs within Lincolnshire	"Also, these 4 huge proposals are not the only ones in Lincolnshire (there are at least 9 proposed for this county alone). The difference is that these 4 schemes, are all within a few miles of each other"	The Applicant notes this comment also. Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] . Cumulative effects assessments for each topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with the NSIPs identified in paragraph 2.5.9 of C6.2.2 ES Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037] (being West Burton Solar Project, Gate Burton Energy Park and Tillbridge Solar). This assessment is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.

Doreen Albone [PDA-013]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
DA-01	Cumulative Development	Requesting that the Schemes be heard together	"The sheer scale of all these solar proposals should be heard all together as they are all in such a small area. They are to big for people to submit separate items. 2 of these proposals are by the same company. The time schedule is far to small for us all to respond."	The Applicant notes this comment but respectfully disagrees.

Rebecca Allen [PDA-014]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
RA-01	Viewpoints	Suggested locations for site inspections	<p>"Normanby Road - the 2 right angle bends leading from the centre of Stow village, passing firstly the wall of St Mary's - Stow Minster. To see the potential for damage to this important heritage asset by abnormal loads - specifically the 16 axle vehicle carrying the heaviest load that will be travelling north to turn right at Cotgarth Lane in Willingham. The inappropriate nature of the road (with its right angle bends and proximity to the Churchyard wall and monastery ruins and private residences) for such a vehicle to travel along. Not private land</p> <p>The 'narrows' between Ingham Road (Coates) and Stow Lane (Ingham). This stretch of single carriage road with passing places is totally inappropriate for use by the large volume and size of construction traffic proposed. See the width of the road, its rural nature and the trees and hedgerows in the ditches either side. Not private land. If this road is restricted for traffic use at the same time as Fleets Lane, it will make a very long diversion for those traveling between the affected villages.</p> <p>Pooh Sticks Bridge Seat - at the junction of Coates Lane and the North end of Green Lane. Following a public consultation as to where locals would like seats locating, this proved a very popular choice. See the location, its views and its position on the popular walking circuit from Stow village, north up Normanby Road to the flat tops, east along Coates Lane to Pooh Sticks Bridge, south down Green Lane and then west along Ingham Road. Not on private land</p> <p>West Farm Cottages at Normanby, to the West of Normanby Road, the very close proximity of the underground high voltage cable to residences and its effect on the health of the residents. Partly on private land.</p>	The Applicant acknowledges these suggestions as put to the Examining Authority.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>Thorpe Lane, going east from its junction with Fleets Road, over Thorpe Bridge towards Thorpe le Fallows. The road is narrow with mature hedges and inappropriate for use by project construction traffic. The road is part of 2 popular recreation routes - Thorpe Bridge, south on the public footpath alongside the Till towards Tillbridge, then going east to the public bridleway that goes north to the pond on Thorpe Lane and back to Thorpe Bridge.. and secondly - east from Thorpe Bridge on Thorpe Lane, through Thorpe le Fallows, North at The Lodge on the public Bridleway to Ingham Road, and then crossing Ingham Road to follow the road to Coates Church, before either retracing or continuing on Coates Lane to Green Lane, south to Ingham Road, continuing then on Fleets Lane and back to Thorpe Bridge. These routes will both be affected by the proposed project. Not private land."</p>	

James A Arden [PDA-016]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
JAA-01	Viewpoints	Suggested locations for site inspections	<p>"Green Lane - between Coates Lane and Ingham Road - to see the rural nature of the lane which is used by locals for running, walking and horse-riding, see the flora and fauna visible there (throughout the year), see the proximity of the house on Ingham Road and why it is not appropriate for it to be used as a route for vehicles connected to the project. Although the application has not yet been dealt with by Lincoln County Council, it is currently waiting designation as a Public Bridleway. Not private land.</p> <p>Normanby Road - the 2 right angle bends leading from the centre of Stow village, passing firstly the wall of St Mary's - Stow Minster. To see the potential for damage to this important heritage asset by abnormal loads - specifically the 16 axle vehicle carrying the heaviest load that will be travelling north to turn right at Cotgarth Lane in Willingham. The inappropriate nature of the road (with its right angle bends and proximity to the Churchyard wall and monastery ruins and private residences) for such a vehicle to travel along. Not private land The 'narrows' between Ingham Road (Coates) and Stow Lane (Ingham). This stretch of single carriage road with passing places is totally inappropriate for use by the large volume and size of construction traffic proposed. See the width of the road, its rural nature and the trees and hedgerows in the ditches either side. Not private land. If this road is restricted for traffic use at the same time as Fleets Lane, it will make a very long diversion for those traveling between the affected villages.</p> <p>Pooh Sticks Bridge Seat - at the junction of Coates Lane and the North end of Green Lane. Following a public consultation as to where locals would like seats locating, this proved a very popular choice. See the location, its views and its position on the popular walking circuit from Stow village, north up Normanby Road to the flat tops, east along Coates Lane to Pooh Sticks Bridge,</p>	The Applicant acknowledges these suggestions as put to the Examining Authority.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>south down Green Lane and then west along Ingham Road. Not on private land</p> <p>West Farm Cottages at Normanby, to the West of Normanby Road, the very close proximity of the underground high voltage cable to residences and its effect on the health of the residents. Partly on private land.</p> <p>Thorpe Lane, going east from its junction with Fleets Road, over Thorpe Bridge towards Thorpe le Fallows. The road is narrow with mature hedges and inappropriate for use by project construction traffic. The road is part of 2 popular recreation routes - Thorpe Bridge, south on the public footpath alongside the Till towards Tillbridge, then going east to the public bridleway that goes north to the pond on Thorpe Lane and back to Thorpe Bridge.. and secondly - east from Thorpe Bridge on Thorpe Lane, through Thorpe le Fallows, North at The Lodge on the public Bridleway to Ingham Road, and then crossing Ingham Road to follow the road to Coates Church, before either retracing or continuing on Coates Lane to Green Lane, south to Ingham Road, continuing then on Fleets Lane and back to Thorpe Bridge. These routes will both be affected by the proposed project. Not private land</p>	

Andy Ayres [PDA-017]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
AA-01	The Scheme Cumulative Development	Cumulative Developments	<p>"I am concerned that the sheer number and complexity of the numerous solar projects in this area of Lincolnshire is overwhelming.</p> <p>As there are being seen as separate, many people see this as just a few solar panels in a field but at the weekend as I was driving around I realised how many of the fields within the boundaries of A156 / A1500 / B1398 / A631 square are going to be used for solar panels. It is easy to identify them due to the archaeological trenches which have been dug, peered into and then covered over."</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.
AA-02	The Scheme Community Engagement	Resource pressures for those wanting to be involved	<p>"Unfortunately, the pressure group opposed to these projects do not have the time and resources to create smart graphics to show what the overall land usage will be.</p> <p>The developers seems to have unlimited budgets to send our project packs etc telling us not to worry. I have seen some mention of the dangers of Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) but this hardly seems to be mentioned in the developer handouts</p> <p>My own view is getting to the stage of it being pointless to comment / attend meetings / opposed the development as it is going to happen irrespective of the pro's and con's"</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges those points raised by the Party.</p> <p>With respect to the Battery Energy Storage System, the Applicant points the party to the Applicant's response provided to Fillingham Parish Meeting within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representation [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] (see 'FPM-15').</p>

David Beech [PDA-019]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
DB-01	The Scheme Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Processes	<p>"I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my concerns regarding the separate planning processes for the two adjacent solar farm projects, Cottam and West Burton and the other 2 also being considered, in our community. I believe it is essential that these projects be considered together rather than independently. The benefits of such a joint consideration are numerous, including the efficient use of resources, better environmental assessment, and a more comprehensive approach to community impact.</p> <p>It is clear that these solar farm projects share geographical proximity, and any decision made regarding one project is likely to impact the other. By evaluating these projects jointly, we can avoid redundant assessments and streamline the planning process, thus saving valuable time and resources for both the developers and the relevant regulatory bodies and members of the local community.</p> <p>Furthermore, a comprehensive evaluation of the environmental impact of these projects, when considered together, would provide a more accurate assessment of potential consequences. The cumulative effects on local wildlife, soil quality, water sources, and other ecological factors should be thoroughly examined. Approaching these projects separately may lead to a fragmented understanding of the potential environmental risks and hamper the effectiveness of mitigation measures.</p> <p>Additionally, considering the community impact of both projects in unison allows for a more holistic assessment of factors such as visual aesthetics, noise levels, traffic patterns, and overall land use. By doing so, we can</p>	<p>The Applicant notes these comments but respectfully disagrees.</p> <p>As noted within the Rule 6 letter [PD-006] Annex E, the Applicant is to produce a "Report on the interrelationship with other National Infrastructure projects" for each Deadline. This report will enable the Examining Authority, as well as those interested parties, to better understand the interrelationships between NSIPs.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>ensure that the collective benefits to our community are maximized, and any potential challenges are appropriately addressed.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to encourage the relevant authorities to evaluate these adjacent solar farm projects together. This approach aligns with the principles of efficient resource utilization, comprehensive environmental assessment, and a community focused perspective. It will ultimately result in a more well-informed and balanced decision-making process.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that your commitment to our community's well-being will guide your actions in this important issue."</p>	

Sue Bingham [PDA-020]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SB-01	Cumulative Development	Requesting the schemes be heard together	"How are we supposed to keep track of these four massive schemes? I don't know what I'm supposed to be commenting on in this precise moment but I do know these schemes should be examined as one and one submission should be necessary. These are in close proximity to each other and indeed two of them are from Island Green Power. Are they relying on confusion and time scales to divide the local population?"	The Applicant notes this comment but respectfully disagrees with the Party's statements of perceived intent.
SB-02	Cumulative Development	Requesting the schemes be heard together	"They are a part of at least 9 massive solar projects within Lincolnshire alone; the bread basket of the country as regards agriculture and food production. As with HS2, this is a massive lack of foresight and frankly panic about the energy and climate crisis that will be of huge detriment to food production, the environment and quality of life in this county."	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The Applicant points the party to its energy-related response to issue reference 'ENG-07' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider that the Scheme would result in food security impacts either alone or cumulatively. The UK annual balance of domestically produced food is sensitive to non-planning factors including weather and markets. The relevant assessment for policy purposes (and therefore decision-making purposes under the Planning Act 2008) is one that is based on the grade of the agricultural land, rather</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				than its current use and the intensity of that use. In terms of key threats to UK food security, the Defra UK Food Security Report highlights that the main threat is climate change.
SB-03	Cumulative Development		<p>"Planners may have looked at Lincolnshire and decided it is sparsely populated hence not much opposition to plans. How wrong they are.</p> <p>These projects are so ill conceived as to be ludicrous to those who live and work here. Solar energy is marvellous in the right contexts. It should not be taking up valuable food producing land and destroying the environment."</p>	<p>The Applicant points the party to its site selection response to issue reference 'ALT-18' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>
SB-04	The Scheme The Applicant	Decommissioning Activities	<p>"These companies will not exist at the end of the time frame envisaged for these projects. Once here the land will become an industrial area, destroyed for generations. Indeed, I understand the companies will soon be sold off to foreign investors if and when they get this monstrous plan through."</p>	<p>The powers set out in the draft DCO are granted to the undertaker. Upon decommissioning, the Scheme will be returned to its previous condition, as detailed in paragraph 2.1.1 of C7.2 Outline Decommissioning Statement [APP-338].</p> <p>The Applicant points the party to its decommissioning response to issue reference 'GEN-17' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SB-05	The Scheme Transport and Access	Construction Period and Access Routes	"I understand Tillbridge solar and maybe the others too, are planning to bring heavy plant through the village of Willingham by Stow. The high street is already frequently blocked by cars parked and there is a GP surgery at the bottom of the high street. I could list many details of opposition to these plans but I do not have time to go through all the details."	The Applicant points the party to its transport response to issue reference 'TRA-17' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
SB-06	The Scheme	Objection to the Application	"My under the threat of these proposals. I wish to be considered for any representation I am allowed to make at whatever meetings are called as I feel so strongly that they should not be granted planning"	The Applicant notes this comment.
SB-07	The Scheme	BESS Fire Safety	"Fire risk is a massive consideration from the completed installations. Pollution and danger from heavy construction plant and maintenance works is another concern. This is money making greed and has no place in a considered and sustainable energy plan for the country"	With respect to the Battery Energy Storage System, the Applicant points the party to the Applicant's response provided to Fillingham Parish Meeting within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representation [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] (see 'FPM-15').

The Bingham family [PDA-021]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
TBF-01	Viewpoints	Suggested locations for site inspections	<p>"Willingham by Stow : Cotgarth lane, Stonepit lane. A popular dog walking, children cycling route around the village. A quiet road along one side of residential properties. Not private land.</p> <p>Fillingham Lane and Gypsy lane (non metalled, grass lane). Not private land. A quiet rural lane accessed by farmers and a few properties. Used regularly and extensively by runners, cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>Marton Road from Willingham to Marton. A very narrow road with passing places and continually shifting ground. The road often shifts and drops considerably. A quiet rural lane used by local traffic, farmers, runners, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Not private land.</p> <p>I also second all the site visits suggested by Clare Ella:</p> <p>Green lane, between Coates and Ingham road leading to Pooh Sticks bridge near Normanby Gorse. Not private land. Quiet, much used dog walking, horse riding route.</p> <p>Stow Minster and the village. Narrow corners.</p> <p>The Narrows. Road between Stow and Ingham. As per its name. Quiet and rural. Used by cyclists and horse riders. Normanby by Stow. Sharp bends.</p> <p>There will be nowhere safe for local residents to walk, cycle or ride safely."</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges these suggestions as put to the Examining Authority.</p> <p>The Applicant points the party to its transport response to issue reference 'TRA-09' as contained within C8.1.2</p> <p>The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Mr and Mrs S Booth [PDA-022] and Stephen John Booth [PDA-023]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
MSB-01	The Scheme Other Environmental Matters: Electro Magnetic Fields	Cable Route Corridor	<p>[PDA-022]</p> <p>"I am writing to express my extreme concern regarding the proposed routing of the main power cable for the Cottam Solar project at West Farm, Normanby by Stow DN21 5LQ (What3words succumbs.calms.alarm) If the proposed project goes ahead (which I object to) then the cable route, with its high "electromagnetic fields and associated health risks to those living nearby, will pass very close to a number of properties including my family residence.</p> <p>I would urge that a site visit is conducted prior to any permissions being given and that an alternative route approximately 150 metres South, crossing the grass field at West Farm before crossing Stow Road B1241 (What3Words rarely.mega.sampled) be considered. This would be an easier route to use, crossing fields instead of tarmac roadways, private driveways and gardens and this would take the cable route well away from the current and proposed houses at West Farm and West Farm Cottages.</p> <p>My concerns are that if this ill-conceived project is to proceed, the current route will lead to massive and unnecessary disruption to the local residents during the construction phase, as the driveways where vehicles are parked will be cut off. The health risks to residents are being ignored by the cable being sited near to housing. The current route crosses the property of two land owners but consulting with a third landowner could facilitate this alternative route. The third landowner has already been approached by one of the other local solar projects with a view to cable routing. Why has the Cottam Solar project not consulted with this landowner?"</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the Party's suggested location for a site visit.</p> <p>The Applicant points the party to its electromagnetic field response to issue reference '7A-42' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>With respect to the Party's construction phase concerns, the Applicant points the party to its transport-related response to issue reference 'TRA-02' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
MSB-02	Viewpoints	Suggested locations for site inspections	<p>[PDA-023]</p> <p>"Linking to my comments made in Submission 19883,</p> <p>I would suggest that a site visit is held at West Farm and West Farm Cottages, Normanby by Stow, DN21 5LQ to look at alternative cable routes away from these properties. The proposed cable route passes close to a number of properties at this location, yet there is an easier and safer alternative route to be considered.</p> <p>The reasons for this request are firstly, that there are potential health implications from living near to cables emitting electromagnetic fields, these cables will pass close to a number of properties on the route that is currently being proposed. Secondly there will be unnecessary disruption to these householders whilst the cable is being installed, digging up roadways, driveways, preventing vehicle parking at those properties and even a garden belonging to 1 West Farm Cottages. Thirdly there is a much easier potential route that I am led to understand has not been fully explored by the appointed land agents. This land belongs to the owners of the house at West Farm, C Pace & R Munn, and it would require access to their private land to view the alternative cable route.</p> <p>The current proposed route of concern passes through land owned by two local landowners, this is close to the public road and is the access to the properties of West Farm and West Farm Cottages, therefore it is possible to see this area of concern without further access to private land.</p> <p>The attached images, 1-4 show the current proposed cable route and how close it passes to houses, including crossing the garden of 1 West Farm Cottages. The barns shown have planning permission to become four houses very soon, with the proposed cable passing directly next to these.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges these suggestions as put to the Examining Authority.</p> <p>Again, with respect to electromagnetic fields, the Applicant respectfully points the party to its electromagnetic field response to issue reference '7A-42' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			Image 5 from Google Maps shows the approximate proposed cable route in RED and the alternative route I suggest in BLUE crossing the fields behind West Farm and well away from any houses."	

Gaynor Collins [PDA-026]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
GC-01	n Community Consultation		<p>"It would seem that the inspectorate are not interested in what the public have to say on these matters and feel it is unimportant for us to be included. Surely, given the number of these projects which are springing up in our local area, it would only seem fair for us to be able to look at all the information and comment on it. It appears that the companies leading these projects are almost working as one to overcome what the local communities think and feel about these monstrosities they wish to erect in our beautiful countryside.</p> <p>It feels very much like these projects are already a done deal with little/no regard for what the local people think. I look forward to your comments."</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its collaboration-related response to issue reference 'NCC-01' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Jill Cowan [PDA-028]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
JC-01	The Scheme Landscape and Visual Impact Ecology and Biodiversity Climate Change	Scheme Impacts	"I really think that alot more consideration is given to all solar farms. They would be taking away not only the beauty of the countryside and the habitats of the wildlife that lives there but ruining valuable growing land for decades to come, let alone taking away many jobs from the countryside. Also making a few unscrupulous men rich before they move on to the next area and see what devastation they can cause. I urge you to give deep consideration to the damage that this will do to this area and surrounding ones when we are covered in cheap Chinese solar panels. What's happened then to carbon reduction?"	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its landscape-related response to issue reference 'LAN-01' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The Applicant also points the Party to its ecology-related response to issue reference 'ECO-04' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>Finally, the Applicant points the Party to its climate change response to issue reference 'CC-08' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Janet Dover [PDA-029]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
JD-01	The Scheme Cumulative Development	Scale of the Scheme	"This huge scheme is one of 4 mega solar panel industrial sites planned in this area, it is proposed to place these, together with battery storage, transformers, inverters & cable routes on what is predominantly fertile arable farmland. A particular worry with war in Ukraine and a poor Rice harvest."	The Applicant points the Party to its soils and agriculture response to issue reference 'ELMP-01' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .
JD-02	Ecology and Biodiversity Construction Phase Transport and Access Socio economics tourism and recreation Hydrology and Flood Risk Glint and Glare Battery Energy	The Scheme	<p>"I am vehemently opposed to this scheme and the others in the area for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on the areas indigenous wildlife & habitats, particularly ranging animals, deer, fox etc. Bats (a recent report indicates adverse impact on bats in & around Solar sites) Birds esp. Skylark & Lapwing. The destruction of hedgerows & trees. 2. Construction: The impact on physical & mental health over the period of construction piling 12 hours per day 7 days a week 2-3 years. 3. Traffic around 500 vehicle trips per day, inc abnormal loads, HGV, light goods cars minibuses etc. over a 2-3 + year period. Impact on countryside roads not designed for such heavy traffic, that are already in a poor state of repair. 4. Impact on village communities and agricultural trades and businesses, impact on tenant farmers. Loss of produce and GDP. 5. Increased flood risk from panel runoff onto compacted substrate, probable desiccation of fertile top soil under panels, being wind blown. ruining the nutritional farming soils. 	<p>The Applicant acknowledge those comments made by the Party and responds in turn below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant points the Party to its ecology-related response to issue reference 'ECO-04' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2]. 2. The Applicant points the Party to its socio-economic response to issue reference 'STR-10' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
	Storage System Landscape and Visual Impact Energy Need		<p>6. Solar panels & equipment mined, processed and manufactured using mainly coal fired generation & allegedly utilising</p> <p>7. Adverse Impact on local tourism.</p> <p>8. local property price depreciation without offers of compensation.</p> <p>9. Very few (post construction) full time job opportunities but a loss of traditional agricultural, engineering and farming supply industries in the area & nationwide.</p> <p>10. Glint & Glare for road users & aircraft.</p> <p>11. Battery Storage BSS is potentially dangerous, sudden fires & explosive runaway fires that are difficult to extinguish or contain. Local Fire & Rescue services probably do not have the equipment, manpower, or in depth experience to tackle such a dangerous blaze. Toxic fume emissions may be hazardous to firefighters & residents.</p> <p>12. Landscape and farmland may suffer such damage & degradation that it may never be able to be returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>13. End of life disposal of old panels, recycling is difficult & expensive, what guarantees are there that they will not be disposed in landfill either here or export the problem abroad.</p> <p>14. Inefficient & intermittent Solar, the summer of 23 has been very poor for solar generation, overcast skies have resulted in a higher degree of gas turbine generation.</p> <p>15. The promises of cheap power via renewables is mythical if the intermittent output that is generated is priced at the most expensive fuel medium, which currently is gas</p>	<p>3. The Applicant points the Party to its transport-related response to issue reference 'TRA-03' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>4. The Applicant points the Party to its socio-economic response to issue reference 'SPM-04' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>5. The Applicant points the Party to its hydrology-related response to issue reference 'HY-02' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>6. The Applicant points the Party to its climate change response to issue reference 'CC-08' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>7. The Applicant points the Party to its socio-economic response to issue reference 'MGBPC-08' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>8. The Applicant points the Party to its socio-economic response to issue reference 'STR-09' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>9. The Applicant points the Party to its socio-economic response to issue reference 'STR-17' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>10. The Applicant points the Party to its glint and glare response to issue reference 'GG-02' as contained within C8.1.2 The</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>11. The Applicant points the Party to its Battery Energy Storage System Fire Risk response to issue reference 'OEM-04' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>12. The Applicant points the Party to its decommissioning-related response to issue reference 'PLA-06' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>13. The Applicant points the Party to its waste-related response to issue reference 'WAS-02' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>14. The Applicant points the Party to its energy-related response to</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>issue reference '7A-32' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>15. The Applicant points the Party to its energy-related response to issue reference '7A-36' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Michael Dover [PDA-030]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
MD-01	Cumulative Development	Requesting the schemes be heard together	<p>"With the announcement that four major NSIP solar projects totalling in excess of 10,000 Acres of mainly high productive arable farming land, people asked that the impact of these four huge projects be considered as one. The developers are working in collaboration and I believe they are all represented by the same legal team too. However the resulting pressure on individual households to I put relevant representations, objections and attend planning inspectorate hearings is unfairly weighted in the favour of the developers. Gate Burton I'd currently being heard, with Cottam and West Burton schemes beginning early next month and within days of each other, with Tillbridge scheme due to be announced soon,</p> <p>It is grossly unfair to to run these scheme hearing almost concurrently, it gives individuals as well as councils no real time to prepare for or being able to attend meetings.</p> <p>Developers however, only need to concentrate on their own scheme.</p> <p>I maintain that the impact of the four schemes should be considered collectively, however as this request was denied, I believe it only fair that each of these mammoth schemes be considered in toto and before considering the next."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>As noted within the Rule 6 letter [PD-006] Annex E, the Applicant is to produce a "Report on the interrelationship with other National Infrastructure projects" for each Deadline. This report will enable the Examining Authority, as well as those interested parties, to better understand the interrelationships between NSIPs.</p>

Pam Duncan [PDA-032]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
D-01	Viewpoints	Suggested locations for site inspections	<p>"Green Lane - between Coates Lane and Ingham Road on north side of Ingham Road. - to view the rural nature of the lane which is grassed not tarmacked and used by locals for running, walking and horse-riding, see the flora and fauna visible there (throughout the year), see the proximity of the houses on Ingham Road and why it is not appropriate for it to be used as a route for vehicles connected to the project. Although the application has not yet been dealt with by Lincoln County Council, it is currently waiting designation as a Public Bridleway. Not private land.</p> <p>Normanby Road - the two right angle bends leading north from the centre of Stow village, passing two historically significant houses (2, Stow Park Road and 3, Normanby Lane) and the wall of St Mary's - Stow Minster. To see the potential for damage to this important heritage asset by abnormal loads - specifically the 16 axle vehicle carrying the heaviest load that will be travelling north to turn right at Cotgarth Lane in Willingham. The inappropriate nature of the road (with its right angle bends and proximity to the churchyard wall and monastery ruins and private residences) for such a vehicle to travel along. Environmental Statement Chapter 13 13.4.21, 13.4.22 and 13.7.12). Not private land</p> <p>The 'narrows' between Ingham Road (Coates) and Stow Lane (Ingham). This stretch of single carriage road with passing places is totally inappropriate for use by the large volume and size of construction traffic proposed. See the width of the road, its rural nature and the trees and hedgerows in the ditches either side. Not private land. If this road is restricted for traffic use at the same time as Fleets Lane, it will make for very significant diversions for residents and delivery persons traveling between the affected villages.</p>	The Applicant acknowledges these suggestions as put to the Examining Authority.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>Pooh Sticks Bridge Seat - at the junction of Coates Lane and the North end of Green Lane. Following a public consultation as to where locals would like seats locating, this proved a very popular choice. See the location, its views and its position on the popular walking circuit from Stow village, north up Normanby Road to the flat tops, east along Coates Lane to Pooh Sticks Bridge, south down Green Lane and then west along Ingham Road. Not on private land</p> <p>West Farm Cottages at Normanby, to the West of Normanby Road, the very close proximity of the underground high voltage cable to residences and its potential effect on the health of the residents. Partly on private land.</p> <p>Thorpe Lane, going east from its junction with Fleets Road, over Thorpe Bridge towards Thorpe le Fallows. The road is narrow with mature hedges and inappropriate for use by project construction traffic. The road is part of 2 popular recreation routes - Thorpe Bridge, south on the public footpath alongside the Till towards Tillbridge, then going east to the public bridleway that goes north to the pond on Thorpe Lane and back to Thorpe Bridge.. and secondly - east from Thorpe Bridge on Thorpe Lane, through Thorpe le Fallows, North at The Lodge on the public Bridleway to Ingham Road, and then crossing Ingham Road to follow the road to Coates Church, before either retracing or continuing on Coates Lane to Green Lane, south to Ingham Road, continuing then on Fleets Lane and back to Thorpe Bridge. These routes will both be affected by the proposed project. Not private land"</p>	

Clare Ella [PDA-033] & [PDA-034]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
CE-02	Examination	Stakeholder Engagement	<p>[PDA-033]</p> <p>"How can those who will be affected on a daily basis - for at least 2 generations and potentially up to 70 years - by the construction, operation and decommissioning of solar panels and the related infrastructure / cabling / decimation of the current natural environment, covering 10,000 acres of land within a relatively few miles' radius, realistically make their views heard for each project?</p>	<p>With regard to the "decimation of the current natural environment", the Applicant points the party to its ecology response and landscape response to issue references 'ECO-04' & 'LAN-04' respectively as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>
CE-03	Viewpoints	Suggested locations and reasons for site inspections	<p>[PDA-034]</p> <p>"All these locations are within the area of Cottam 1.</p> <p>Green Lane - between Coates Lane and Ingham Road - to see the rural nature of the lane which is used by locals for running, walking and horse-riding, see the flora and fauna visible there (throughout the year), see the proximity of the house on Ingham Road and why it is not appropriate for it to be used as a route for vehicles connected to the project. Although the application has not yet been dealt with by Lincoln County Council, it is currently waiting designation as a Public Bridleway. Not private land.</p> <p>Normanby Road - the 2 right angle bends leading from the centre of Stow village, passing firstly the wall of St Mary's - Stow Minster. To see the potential for damage to this important heritage asset by abnormal loads - specifically the 16 axle vehicle carrying the heaviest load that will be travelling north to turn right at Cotgarth Lane in Willingham. The inappropriate nature of the road</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges these suggestions as put to the Examining Authority.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>(with its right angle bends and proximity to the Churchyard wall and monastery ruins and private residences) for such a vehicle to travel along. Not private land</p> <p>The 'narrows' between Ingham Road (Coates) and Stow Lane (Ingham). This stretch of single carriage road with passing places is totally inappropriate for use by the large volume and size of construction traffic proposed. See the width of the road, its rural nature and the trees and hedgerows in the ditches either side. Not private land. If this road is restricted for traffic use at the same time as Fleets Road, it will make a very long diversion for those traveling between the affected villages.</p> <p>Pooh Sticks Bridge Seat - at the junction of Coates Lane and the North end of Green Lane. Following a public consultation as to where locals would like seats locating, this proved a very popular choice. See the location, its views and its position on the popular walking circuit from Stow village, north up Normanby Road to the flat tops, east along Coates Lane to Pooh Sticks Bridge, south down Green Lane and then west along Ingham Road. Not on private land</p> <p>West Farm Cottages at Normanby, to the West of Normanby Road, the very close proximity of the underground high voltage cable to residences and its effect on the health of the residents. Partly on private land.</p> <p>Thorpe Lane, going east from its junction with Fleets Road, over Thorpe Bridge towards Thorpe le Fallows. The road is narrow with mature hedges and inappropriate for use by project construction traffic. The road is part of 2 popular recreation routes - Thorpe Bridge, south on the public footpath alongside the Till towards Tillbridge, then going east to the public bridleway that goes north to the pond on Thorpe Lane and back to Thorpe Bridge.. and secondly - east from Thorpe Bridge on Thorpe Lane, through Thorpe le Fallows, North at The Lodge on the public Bridleway to Ingham Road, and then crossing Ingham Road to follow the road to Coates Church, before either retracing or</p>	

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			continuing on Coates Lane to Green Lane, south to Ingham Road, continuing then on Fleets Lane and back to Thorpe Bridge. These routes will both be affected by the proposed project. Not private land"	

Elizabeth Clare Garbutt [PDA-036]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
ECG-01	Viewpoints	Suggested locations and reasons for site inspections	<p>"The suggested site location for a visit by the ExA is along Middle Street (B1398), at or near the post code DN21 5BZ. This is close to Glentworth village, travelling south towards the village of Fillingham. This view is panoramic and gives distant views of the Cottam Solar Projects sites. The Cottam and West Burton power stations are visible on the horizon and are prominent landmarks which have provided the nation with reliable energy for many years. These power stations are single point landmarks and do not cover or become the landscape unlike the proposed schemes. Glint and Glare from the solar arrays will occur and be visible from this view and road network. Also, in conjunction with the other proposed developments it will create an extensive mass or occurrence of Glint and Glare which then becomes the dominant element of the landscape at certain times of the day. Also, the cumulative effect in regards to the landscape and visual impact will be evident at this suggested site location. It is clear from this location that the landscape will be visually dominated by the proposed solar schemes. Therefore, this site location will provide a good indication of the cumulative visual impact of the proposed solar schemes in the West Lindsey District. I recommend the ExA travels this road in its entirety to appreciate the wide, long, open views which are loved and enjoyed by so many people and all its inhabitants. Lastly, the site is visible from public land."</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges these suggestions as put to the Examining Authority.</p>

Carol Gilbert [PDA-038]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
CG-01	Viewpoints	Suggested locations and reasons for site inspections	<p>"I request that you inspect the following locations, since I do not believe the removal of hedgerows or trees in this location is necessary; The area does not require special permission access as it is visible as well as adjacent to Thorpe Lane and Fleets Lane (Thorpe le Fallows, Sturton by Stow and Stow).</p> <p>H275 Thorpe Lane - This hedge is located along the southern boundary of Thorpe Lane and is not, strictly, within the development area. The road is bounded by ditches each side. The highway is adequate for large agricultural machinery and large grain transport HGV's; The hedgerow is largely separated from the road by a wide grass verge and ditch and there is no apparent gain in removal of this particular hedgerow. Yellow Hammer, among other birds, nests in this particular hedge. The removal of this hedgerow will drastically alter the landscape character of the area. Please also note the stand of mature trees adjacent to the River Till. These should be protected as they not only form wildlife habitat but they also help with wind-break and water retention. The removal of these trees will alter the character of the area of Thorpe, Sturton by Stow and Stow.</p> <p>H278, H279, H280 The removal of these hedgerows will have significant visual impact from Sturton by Stow and for the residents of Fleets Lane Cottages. The hedges form a boundary to fields which will not be part of Cottam 1. The advantage of windbreak from the hedging to reduce soil erosion as well as absorbing surface water will be compromised, let alone the disaster for wildlife which relies on this habitat. There appears to be no pertinent reason for removal of these hedgerows.</p> <p>The Consent Order asks for a blanket removal option of any trees including TPO designated ones. There is no information available to state which trees</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges these suggestions as put to the Examining Authority.</p> <p>In certain locations where accesses do not exist, some very minor hedgerow removal is necessary to accommodate access roads between fields, land parcels and solar panel areas. This removal is set out in the Hedgerow Removal Plans in Appendix C of C7.3_A Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Revision A [EN010133/EX1PEX/C7.3_A8.2.3].</p> <p>This removal will involve only very short sections of hedgerow to accommodate internal access roads and will not involve loss of trees, in particular trees protected under any Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs).</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the removal of any section of hedgerows H275, H278, H279 and H280 will be required.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			may be subject to this removal. Again, removal of trees will drastically alter the character of any areas and should be avoided"	

AJ-02	Cumulative Development		"It should be mandated that the two developments being examined concurrently by developer Island Green Power be treated as one development, or at least space them out by six months so that people can interact.	The Applicant notes this comment but respectfully disagrees with the Party in that the Cottam Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project should <i>"be treated as one development"</i> .
-------	------------------------	--	---	---

Andy Johnson [PDA-040]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
AJN-01	Planning Policy	DESNZ Policy and Strategy	<p>"Firstly, thank you for your time in reading and considering my representation. At this point I would like to say that I am in favour of greener energy and support striving towards net zero compliance however the manner in which we are going about this with this proposal is against ESNZ guidelines, and is not the most effective way of balancing / reducing our carbon footprint. Having attended presentations / open forums it is very evident they are currently unable to answer all questions posed and extremely vague on others."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the Party's support of greener energy and net zero compliance.</p> <p>Document C7.11 Statement of Need [APP-350] describes the Government's view that "a secure, reliable, affordable, Net Zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar". The document goes on to describe how this Scheme helps to deliver towards the UK's Net Zero legal obligations. Furthermore, Appendix 3 of C7.5_A Planning Statement Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C7.5_A] details how the Scheme complies with both current and emerging national policy.</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its energy need response to issue reference '7A-32' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>
AJN-02	The Scheme	Cumulative Development Material Sourcing	<p>"1 or 4 applications? The Cottam application I believe should not be taken in isolation I understand there are 2 more applications to be submitted, the 4 applications are all joined up via cabling and are therefore one development they should be viewed as one and the total effects taken into consideration. They are also sharing legal team as well as supplies of materials - same factory in China to produce panels"</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The Applicant has not procured a contract with any manufacturers of panels and thus rebuts the statement <i>"as well as supplies of materials - same factory in China to produce panels"</i>.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
AJN-03	Soils and Agriculture	Soil Grading Impact upon food production	<p>"UK Food Provision & Security Our country currently is far from self-sufficient particularly in the production of food and the loss of potentially up to 10,000 acres (with 4 submissions) will put additional strain on the crop supply. The land I understand is classed as 3b however this figure was measured during the 1980's and has very little value today as farming methods have significantly changed. A truer reflection would be based upon yield of which this land is classed as very high.</p> <p>Permission to retest the land quality has been denied by the land owners – this need to be investigated and a detailed analysis produced with the class and yield statistics.</p> <p>We see the effects of war and how food is being used as a weapon – without land where will the food come from to satisfy our increasing population – bringing it in from overseas will leave us very open to the dictators and war loads of this world. WE MUST REVERSE THE YEAR ON YEAR DECLINE OF UK FOOD PRODUCTION."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>As the Scheme will be decommissioned there will not be a permanent loss of agricultural land. Furthermore, decommissioning mitigation and site restoration measures are set out in C7.2 Outline Decommissioning Statement [APP-338] are secured by Requirement 21 in Schedule 2 of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B].</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) assessment work has been undertaken for the Sites with the site data and results presented in the ES (See C6.3.19.1 ES Appendix 19.1 Agricultural Land Quality Soil Resources and Farming Circumstances [APP-145]). This assessment has been reviewed by Natural England [RR-037] with no concern raised that any survey work was incorrect.</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey results for the Sites are presented at C6.3.19.1 ES Appendix 19.1 Agricultural Land Quality Soil Resources and Farming Circumstances [APP-145]. This ALC assessment work has been undertaken in compliance with Natural England's guidance and has been peer-reviewed ahead of their submission in support of the DCO Application.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				The Applicant points the Party to its food production response to issue reference 'WSPC-04' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .
AJN-04			<p>"The effect on the community cannot be truly accurately measured until after the event however what can be foreseen is the loss of employment, housing of tenant farmers, impact on farm suppliers (machinery, crop support, service industry etc). The personal effect on the hundreds of villages and visitors is again unmeasurable at this stage I assume this will include many of the following: - mental health, loss of the local countryside enjoyment, employment, hospitality sector, property values, minimum of 4 years of construction traffic, permanent security driving round 24/7 CCTV etc.</p> <p>There are dwellings / villages that are very close to the proposal and studies have highlighted the requirement for a safe distance from the panels and batteries. A minimum of 2KM is recommended, developers have no knowledge of this or are following the available science.</p> <p>Village curtilage - all villages have a legal curtilage around them to protect from this type of development – yet again they have no knowledge of this and therefore are possibly encroaching into this area.</p> <p>They are talking about giving back to the communities free charging points etc, - just an unwelcome sweetener"</p>	<p>With regard to the comments made relating to 'loss of employment' and 'tenant farmers', the Applicant points the Party to its socio-economics-related responses to issue references '7A-07' and 'KPCL-12' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>With regard to comments made relating to 'mental health' and 'loss of the local countryside enjoyment', the Applicant points the Party to its socio-economics-related response to issue reference 'FPM-05' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The Applicant is not aware of any empirical evidence to suggest that the presence of solar farms affects nearby property values. The design of the Scheme has been informed by C6.2.8 ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] (the 'LVIA') which takes into account the effects on residential receptors and this includes singular buildings, groups of</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>buildings and towns or villages and thus considers the visual assessment of residential properties. Table 8.15 of the LVIA sets out the selection of initial residential receptors for the purpose of the assessment, the reason for their selection being that the receptors are all within the 1km Study Area for the Scheme and the 0.5km Study Area from the outer boundary of the Cable Route Corridor. This assessment has informed the appropriate setbacks between the Scheme and receptors and the planting mitigation strategy.</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its responses to health, safety, fire risk, and EMF concerns reference 'OEM-01' to 'OEM-08' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2]. The 2km separation distance referred to by the Party is not recognised as a policy nor health and safety requirement or recommendation.</p> <p>The Applicant believes the Party is referring to a village's "development boundary" as defined by local planning policy. Notably, the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023 describes this as the "developed footprint" but does not spatially define this on any of its adopted policy maps. Nonetheless, the purpose of development boundaries is largely to discourage unsuitable</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>development (such as housing or non-agricultural business premises) in the countryside. The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023 explicitly defines renewable energy generation as a development type that is not restricted in the countryside (Policy S1, part 8).</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund – see paragraph 4.8.1 of C7.5_A Planning Statement [EN010133/EX1/C7.5_A]. This fund will be available for community-based benefits such as (but not limited to) community-led energy related projects.</p>
AJN-05	<p>Visual Impact</p> <p>Cultural Heritage</p> <p>Ecology and Biodiversity</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impacts</p> <p>Wildlife and Biodiversity</p>	<p>"The area along the development is of historic interest and value known as the Lincoln Cliff / Jurassic Ridge with currently outstanding views across the Trent Valley. Supporting 3 open water reservoirs with a mass of migratory birds and associated wildlife for consideration. Within the development area there are also historic buildings / village that will be heavily affected by the development.</p> <p>This area also has a high level off wildlife and biodiversity that will be negatively affected.</p> <p>The application wishers to have the option of removing all hedgerows yet again unmeasurable effect on carbon absorption and wildlife impact.</p> <p>Wildlife movements will be heavily restricted by the fencing in of the panels for security. Currently the government have</p>	<p>With regard to the Lincoln Cliff and Jurassic Ridge, the Applicant points the Party to its visual impact response to issue reference 'LAN-02' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>With regard to the Trent Valley, the Applicant points the Party to its visual impact response to issue reference 'MGBPC-07' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>With regard for migratory birds, the Applicant points the Party to its ecology and biodiversity response to issue reference 'MGBPC-06' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>committed to a world plan on reducing the effect on biodiversity – how does this development possible fit with these commitments? They say they are setting aside areas in proportion to the development however cannot say where & size.”</p>	<p>Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>With regard to historic buildings, the Applicant points the Party to its cultural heritage response to issue reference '7A-13' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>With regard to affects to biodiversity, the Applicant points the Party to its ecology and biodiversity response to issue reference 'ECO-04' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>With regard to effects to hedgerows, the Applicant points the Party to its ecology and landscape response to issue reference 'LCC-28' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its ecology response to issue reference 'ECO-14', in relation to wildlife movement and biodiversity concerns, as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
AJN-06	The Scheme Energy Need	Alternative Sources of Energy	"When comparing the economics / performance of solar with others it is very clear that this type of renewable energy is well behind other more favourable methods wind, wave etc and produces more damage to the environment in panel construction / shipping therefore taking a longer period to achieve a negative impact."	Chapter 10 of C7.11 Statement of Need [APP-350] sets out the economic benefits of solar energy. Section 10.2 shows how increasing capacities of solar generation will reduce the price of power for UK consumers. Figure 10.3 draws on UK Government analysis which shows that large scale solar, already being highly competitive against current conventional and renewable generation costs, is predicted to retain a cost advantage for the decades ahead.
AJN-07	The Scheme	Land Use and Decommissioning	<p>"Having spoken to the developers they are unable to answer / no comment on several points that I see as additional concerns about these projects.</p> <p>The land, use of after the period of industrialisation – I understand that restoration to farming land cannot take place, wasteland or industrial buildings?</p> <p>I believe after 10 years the land will have acquired change of use status and therefore housing can then be built as the solar revolution will be overtaken.</p> <p>Decommissioning – who will be picking up the considerable future bill ££? I note that several councils are already footing the costs of failed projects. What considerations / money reserves will be ring fenced or is the tax payer expected to foot the bill?</p> <p>Currently the panels will all finish up in landfill as recycling is not available, will the cost will be meet by the tax payer?"</p>	<p>In respect of the comments relating to land use, the Applicant points the Party to its response to issue reference 'PLA-05' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>Funding for the decommissioning of the Scheme will be the responsibility of the operator/ undertaker of the Scheme at the end of the operational phase.</p> <p>The panels are predominantly made from recyclable materials. The Applicant refers the parties to Table 20.7 in C6.2.20 ES Chapter 20 Waste [APP-055] which identifies estimated volumes of waste from decommissioning. Approximately 95% of the panel weight is made from glass and metal frames, which can easily be reused and recycled. The remaining silicon and</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				electrical waste can be partially recycled at Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) facilities.
AJN-08	The Scheme Air Quality OEM: Major Accidents and Disasters	Battery Energy Storage System and Converter Safety	<p>"Batteries & converters they are unable to provide satisfactory answers to noise levels, fire security and health exposure risks.</p> <p>I have seen currently no risk assessment from the Fire Brigade on tackling a fire nor facilities on site to tackle this situation.</p> <p>On the subject of an incident, they cannot confirm a distance cordon and the decommission process with the contaminated land. An emergency evacuation plan is not available for viewing / reviewing."</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its battery safety mitigation and management response to issue reference 'FPM-15' with regard to fire security and health exposure risks as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The Applicant also points the Party to its noise-related response to issue references 'NOI-01' and 'NOI-02' with regard to Battery and converter noise levels as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>Finally, the Applicant points to its Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan response to issue reference 'LCC-30' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>
AJN-09	The Scheme	Sourcing of Materials	"Solar panels – I understand that the production of these is in China and they are being produced by the Uyghur people. These people are already subjected to crimes against humanity and now being used as slave labour. Held in re-education camps with a shoot to kill policy in place. Supporting this would be in itself an acknowledgement of support."	<p>At this time, the Applicant has not procured a contract with any manufacturers of panels.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.4.7 of C7.10 Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan [APP-349] states that "Any procurement of supplies internationally will comply with both national and international law,</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>and all policy and safety measures will be adhered to in the transportation of supplies.”</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that a Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan is secured by Requirement 20 of Schedule 2 to C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B].</p>
AJN-10	Party's Submission	Summary of Submission	<p>“Representation Summary</p> <p>I have spoken to the Department of Energy Security & Net Zero about the current strategy, the information provided clearly details that this planning application has failed to meet the strategy guidelines and therefore I must question the true reasons for this development / application.</p> <p>Solar has a part to offer in our drive to net zero and power security however a balanced common-sense approach must take place. I note that Portsmouth council have introduced a solar on roof policy – a sensible approach and well accepted. This roof top approach is now gaining approval across Europe and is surely a far better alternative.</p> <p>To lose 3500 to 10,000 acres of performing farm land is mind blowing when other solutions are clearly available. The Department of Energy Security & Net Zero document on planning needs to be satisfied in all areas.</p> <p>My simple common-sense approach would be ensuring we have exhausted all other areas, brown land, disused airfields etc as well as introducing solar as part of all future commercial building</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and the points made by the Party.</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its energy need and site selection response to issue reference 'CJM-17' with regard to the Scheme's need as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>applications and retro fitting with government financial support to all large roof areas.</p> <p>Should we still be unable to achieve our targets then careful consideration of other land can take place but remember we need to be able to produce food to feed our population.</p> <p>It is very evident that this is very much a commercial exercise as a large return £ on an investment strategy that government has not taken a sensible approach – knee jerk reaction leading to profiteering of so-called green companies.</p> <p>A final note the planning process for an average local is not easy and having so many deadlines in a short timeframe means items are not given the time they deserve naturally this impacts on all involved.</p> <p>Thank you for your time in taking my comments into consideration.</p>	

Patricia A Mitchell [PDA-046], [PDA-047] & [PDA-048]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
PAM-01	N/A	N/A	[PDA-046] (Attached image)	The Applicant considers the attached image has been corrupted making it illegible.
PAM-02	ECumulative Development		[PDA-047] 1. "The cumulative effects of these 4 NSIP projects in our small rural area on 10,000 acres of BMV agricultural land is prejudicial to the people and area where I live and to the lives of those residents of the 30 affected communities. They are not the only solar projects in Lincolnshire as there are at least 9 large solar schemes proposed for the County.	The Applicant notes the ten points made by the Party. The Applicant is happy for the cumulative impacts of the projects to be considered together if the Planning Inspectorate and Examining Authorities deem it appropriate.
PAM-03	Viewpoints	Suggested locations and reasons for site inspections	[PDA-048] "Take in the view – Thorpe le Fallows (Viewpoint 6 – Winter AVR3 (year 1) figure 8.14.6d Cottam 1 - I deem to be an incomplete and therefore inaccurate presentation for any member of the public viewing this on the Inspectorate's website. (Public road & Private land).	The Applicant acknowledges these suggestions as put to the Examining Authority.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>Recommend Mr Cridland, the ExA, to take in the view along the length of Fleets Road, Fleets Lane and Ingham Road for Cottam 1 site. From Fleets Road this is an elevated view looking over the fragmented development in these fields.</p> <p>Also recommend Mr Cridland travels these roads in their entirety to see the extent of the effect of the scale of solar for the Cottam 1 project. The wide, long, open views which are loved and enjoyed by so many people and all its inhabitants. This area is visible from public land, particularly from the two public footpaths leading towards these fields. Another recommend site location for a visit by the ExA is along Middle Street (B1398). The Cottam and West Burton power stations are visible on the horizon. These power stations are single point landmarks and do not cover or become the landscape unlike the proposed schemes. (Public road)</p> <p>The cumulative effect in regards to the landscape and visual impact of solar panels will be evident along this road as the suggested site location overlooks the villages of Ingham, Cammeringham and Fillingham. It is clear from this location that the landscape will be visually dominated by the proposed solar schemes. Therefore, this site location will provide a good indication of the cumulative visual impact of all four proposed solar schemes in the West Lindsey District.</p> <p>A further view would be to travel along the B1241 heading on the Normanby Road towards Normanby by Stow and onto Stow Road where Glint and Glare from the solar panels on a sharp bend on a downward slope will be visible as this solar site appears, from the map, to come right up to the road side. (Private land and Public road)</p>	

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			On all of these routes there will be an extensive mass of Glint and Glare from a sea of black glass and not the patchwork quilt of crops throughout the year with the changing seasons we have all come to know and love to see."	

Derek Moffatt [PDA-049]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
DM-01	Viewpoints	Suggested locations for site inspections	<p>"B1398 roadside DN21 5BZ affords panoramic views of proposal.</p> <p>B1398 roadside by Fillingham Castle affords views west across Fillingham lake.</p> <p>Continuing due south on Middle Street (no longer B1398) affords further panoramic views westwards."</p>	The Applicant acknowledges these suggestions as put to the Examining Authority.

Tracy Peden [PDA-051]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
TP-01	Cumulative Development Alternatives and Design Evolution Energy Need	Effective Use of Land	"I sent an email previously with no response. Why are the four proposals being treated as separate entities? Why aren't the companies looking at farmland as locations for these industrial sites? Please please stop this madness and use old airfields or disused RAF bases such as kirton lindesy or scampton. Please do the right thing for your children and your grandchildren. We need farmland for food NOT Solar!!"	The Applicant points the party to its effective use of land response provided to 'UPC-07' within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representation [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .

Frank & Julia Powell [PDA-055]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
FJP-01	Examination Procedure	Separate Examination Procedures and Cumulative Development	<p>"As a resident in the immediate area where the proposal to erect 4 Solar Farms of enormous capacity and size in the Lincolnshire countryside I find it totally unacceptable that the Inspectorate is going to examine each application for a solar farms individually. In view of the impact these large and unacceptable solar farms are going to have, firstly on the production of vital food supplies from the land and the enormous upheaval to the country side where they are planned it is imperative that the full combined impact of these solar farms be examined as a whole.</p> <p>In addition you should note the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I suspect that the inspectorate will not devote adequate time to examine each and every application separately. I would be much easier to examine them as a whole and assess the overall impact on the area; 2. I suspect that you will be unnecessarily confused and prejudice by this action; 3. Will other applications (e.g. Island Green Power) gain an unfair advantage by your proposed actions; 4. If each application is to be examined individually you need to plan a much larger gap of weeks not days between each examination to allow the public to make the necessary arrangement to attend the meetings. 5. If the above is acted upon it would send a message to the public that the inspectorate understand and acknowledge the vital public input to the examination of these applications." 	<p>The Applicant notes those comments made by the Party, as directed to the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>The cumulative impacts of the Scheme with the West Burton Solar Project, Gate Burton Energy and Tillbridge Solar have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058]. Cumulative effects assessments for each topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with the NSIPs identified in paragraph 2.5.9 of C6.2.2 ES Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037]. This assessment is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.</p>

Mark Prior [PDA-056]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
MP-01	Cumulative Development		<p>"Either the two Island Green Power Applications should be examined as one, after all they are only 1,000m apart at their closest point and share features such as cable connectors, or West Burton should be heard after Cottam is concluded. Anything else is swamping the local population, and councils, and plays into the hand of the Applicant as opposition will be muted by the sheer volume of the task. By overwhelming the local population, who have until now had no experience of NSIPs, they are effectively being denied their legitimate voice in these schemes. Covering 10,000 acres of farming land with solar panel, batteries and associated infrastructure will have a devastating and generational impact on our local environment, we must not be denied our voice in this process."</p>	<p>To minimise impacts, the Cottam Solar Project, Gate Burton Energy Park and West Burton Solar Project have proposed a shared cable corridor route, and are progressing collaborative work on this matter. Paragraph 4.3.8 of C6.2.4_A ES Chapter 4_Scheme Description Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C6.3.4_A] sets out the Applicant's commitments and the proposed commitments of the promoters of the other local schemes to joint mitigation.</p> <p>The Cottam Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project are separate Applications.</p>

Simon Skelton [PDA-062], [PDA-063] & [PDA-072]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SS-01	Viewpoints	Suggested locations and reasons for site inspections	<p>[PDA-063]</p> <p>"Please consider these important viewing locations.</p> <p>1. SK918856. North Farm, Willingham Road, Fillingham, Gainsborough. DN21 5BJ. Significant visual impact in all directions. Significant blight from Inside and outside of property and on all aspects. Close proximity of the proposal. Shows the unmade single access track to North farm that would be used during construction and to service the proposal. Issues were addressed during consultation. Agreements subsequently recinded. This location is our family home, the Examining Authority is welcome to view the proposal from here at any time.</p> <p>2. SK956843. The public footpath West of the B1398 (Middle Street) Degradation of public amenity. Considerable visual impact from an important elevated viewpoint over and along the whole length of footpath onto Willingham Road. Glint and glare dangers to motorists on the B1398. Public access.</p> <p>3. SK954873. View from the B1398 (Middle Street) best viewed travelling South and Looking West over the Cottam 1 North proposals. There is space to pull in on the East side of the B1398. Industrialising an Area of Great Landscape Value. Significant visual impact. Glint and glare dangers to motorists on the B1398. Public access"</p>	The Applicant acknowledges these suggestions as put to the Examining Authority.
SS-02	Registration for Issue Specific Hearing 1	Agenda Items	<p>[PDA-072]</p> <p>"I would like the following points to be raised during the draft DCO hearing. My initial concerns being:- The draft DCO does not appear to mention the abhorrent 4.5 metre solar panel height that is mentioned in other IGP</p>	The Applicant notes the request made by the Party, as directed to the Planning Inspectorate.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>documents. This is a major visual impact issue and needs to be addressed as soon a possible. Schedule 13 in the dDCO clearly states removal of specified lengths of identified hedgerows, this clear listing adds up to thousands of metres in total! This even includes hedges on my own property. This gung-ho approach shows no consideration to residents and shows total bio diversity hypocrisy. This needs comprehensive restrictions applied, to prevent further unnecessary destruction of our countryside. Powers being sought in the dDCO would lead to the over use of the public highways for plant movements and construction traffic. The cumulative impact of 4 DCOs and the associated road closures and congestion in one area would be hazardous and unmanagable in this rural setting."</p>	

David & Helen Whitehead [PDA-069]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
DHW-01	The Scheme Cumulative Development Examination Procedure	Cumulative Effects	<p>"This is one of four similar applications covering c10,000 acres of intensely-farmed agricultural land. The applications are so similar that they must be examined as one to appreciate the true cumulative impact on the land, local villages, transport infrastructure, wildlife and residents. We live in a small village called Glentworth. Lincolnshire CC has already consented to new oil wells on the boundary of the village resulting in up to 100 HGV's and 100 LGV's during each 24 hour period. All this on a single track road with passing spaces. Our house will be directly impacted by that and potentially now impacted by these four solar farms. Our house will be unsaleable, with views across acres and acres of metal slats, constant noise from the road, dust, light nuisance, fuel fumes, vibration and general discomfort. The enjoyment of our property will be decimated. I have seen no explanation of how the panels and cables will be removed at the end of their usable life. No plan of how they will be removed and recycled. This is not a temporary change to the landscape, this is a generational destruction of farmland and our environment. This application can only be properly examined when taken as a whole, encompassing the other three solar projects."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its cumulative development response to issue reference 'GPC-05' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Graham Worthington [PDA-071]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
GW-01	The Scheme Cumulative Development	Cumulative Assessment	<p>"Does the Cumulative Assessment Site Plan cover all the schemes proposed or just those that fit into the National Strategic Limit category?</p> <p>S of S showing total disregard for the public by having each submission assessed separately and not considering the cumulative effect on the area and not included the government plans for Scampton which are I know outside your remit within the total impact on a small geographical area."</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that C6.4.2.1 - Figure 2.1 - Cumulative Assessments Site Plan [APP-148] includes schemes beyond those defined as an NSIP under Sections 14(1)(a), 15(1) and 15(2) of the Planning Act 2008 such as Field Farm and Bumble Bee Farm.</p> <p>The Applicant is happy for the cumulative impacts of the projects to be considered together if the Planning Inspectorate and Examining Authorities deem it appropriate.</p>

3 The Applicant's responses to Additional Submissions made by Interested Parties

Stow Parish Council [AS-017]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SPC-01	The Scheme Cumulative Development	Summary of Submission	<p>"This submission provides the views of Stow Parish Council (SPC hereafter) on the application by Cottam Solar Project Ltd for a Development Consent Order for the Cottam Solar Panel farm.</p> <p>Recently there has been a spate of applications for development of solar farms in our area, namely: Cottam1, 2 and 3; West Burton 1, 2 and 3; Gate Burton; Tillbridge Solar and Stow Park. Stow Parish is specifically affected by Cottam 1, but also West Burton 3 and Stow Park (Luminous).</p> <p>SPC has seen and supports the document sent to The Planning Inspectorate for England (PINS) by the Sturton by Stow and Stow Parishes' Neighbourhood Planning Group submitted on 19/7/23. This document bears similarities, but we have made additions and alterations in this submission to incorporate aspects specific to our Parish."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and will respond in turn to the additions and alterations made by the Party to the Sturton by Stow and Stow Parishes' Neighbourhood Planning Group's submission.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to the Relevant Representations, reference RR-18, made by Stow Parish Council in C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>
SPC-02			<p>"The Government's drive for a zero-carbon economy by 2050 is supported by SPC, but the right balance needs to be achieved between the scale and location for renewable energy infrastructure and loss of our valued heritage, agricultural land for food, landscapes, biodiversity and public amenity such as walking, horse-riding and cycling routes, and access to the countryside for health and wellbeing. We comment further on these aspects in this submission about the proposed Cottam development, but they are magnified by the many other solar farms proposed nearby. This impacts on the local area not just due to the 4-5 years of construction traffic, noise and pollution, but also the sheer scale of all solar farms that the area will be subjected to."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the Party's support for the Government's 2050 Net Zero Target.</p> <p>Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058]. Cumulative effects assessments for each topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with the NSIPs identified in paragraph 2.5.9 of C6.2.2 ES Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037] . This assessment is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17.
SPC-03			<p>"The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2022 does not provide a framework for guiding large-scale solar farm development proposals. Our Neighbourhood Plan did not anticipate, and was not written, to address concurrent large-scale applications for commercial solar PV farms. However, the aspirations of the electorate e.g., regarding conservation of heritage assets, enhancement of biodiversity, access to the countryside are very clear in our Neighbourhood Plan, which was adopted in July 2022. For this reason, we allude to it in the following text.</p> <p>The note in the developer's application, which seems to confer a positive stance to large commercial solar farm developments in our Neighbourhood Plan, is incorrect and should be dismissed."</p>	<p>As set out within the C7.5_A Planning Statement [EN010133/EX1/C7.5_A] at Section 5.6, the Applicant expects that the Energy NPSs will be attributed most weight when the application is determined under Section 105 of the Planning Act, and that the NPPF although less relevant, will also be important. The Applicant also considers that considerable weight should be attached to the Draft Energy NPSs.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.9.1 of the Planning Statement explains that it considers the conformity of the Scheme with Development Plan</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>Documents (DPDs) to the extent that they are likely to be important and relevant in the SoS's decision. The Sturton by Stow and Stow Neighbourhood Plan 2019 – 2036 (Final Approved Version March 2022), is, therefore, less relevant in the decision making process than the National planning policy documents highlighted above.</p> <p>The compliance of the Scheme with local planning policy is considered by the relevant parts of Section 6 of the Planning Statement. The matters addressed by the local planning policies are considered in the context of the nationally significant benefits that the Scheme will bring, and the likely increased level of effect that is associated with, and acceptable for, a scheme of this scale in comparison with a smaller scheme that would deliver only locally or regionally significant benefits.</p> <p>In relation to the Sturton by Stow and Stow Neighbourhood Plan 2019 – 2036 (Final Approved</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				Version March 2022), the Applicant notes the Parish Council's stance on the Scheme's conformity with the Neighbourhood Plan.
SPC-04			<p>"Stow is in the district of West Lindsey. Stow Parish is in the Till Vale and is overwhelmingly agricultural with wide, open vistas, for example, across the fields to Lincoln Cathedral on the limestone ridge.</p> <p>Within our parish, in the area covered by the Cottam proposals for solar panels, there are three Scheduled Monuments. These are covered in Policy 6 of our Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site of a college and Benedictine abbey, St Mary's Church in Stow (1012976) [Historic England listing] • Coates medieval settlement and moated site (1016979). • Medieval Bishop's Palace and Deer Park (1019229). <p>In paragraph 13.5.1 of the Environmental Statement: Chapter 13 Cultural Heritage it states: 'none of the scheduled monuments are located within any of the sites.' However, there are proposals for panels near to the sites at Coates and Stow Park. There are several Grade 1 and 2 listed buildings, on the construction routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Mary's Church (1146624) • St Edith's Church (1146742) • Stables and Pigeon Cote (1146735) and Threshing Barn (1064063), Church End Farm. • Manor Farm (1359486). 	<p>With regard for the Lincoln Cathedral, the Applicant points the party to its cultural heritage response to issue reference '7A-19' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the location of designated heritage assets detailed within the Stow Parish as detailed by Stow Parish Council.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement within C6.3.13.5 ES Appendix 13.5 [APP-125 to APP-128] provides a detailed assessment of the designated heritage assets located within the Stow Parish and any potential impacts caused by the Scheme. The assessment identified that there would be no change/Negligible change to Site of a college and</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>And buildings that are not listed, but are considered as historically significant locally, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Farm, Normanby • 2, Stow Park Road, Stow. • 3, Normanby Road, Stow. <p>Although there may be no direct visual impact of the final solar farms to these buildings, the long-term potential structural damage to these, plus many other historic dwellings, caused by the construction process has not been addressed in any of the proposals.</p>	<p>Benedictine abbey, St Mary's Church in Stow (1012976), Medieval Bishop's Palace and Deer Park (1019229), St Mary's Church (1146624), St Edith's Church (1146742), Stables and Pigeon Cote (1146735), Threshing Barn (1064063), Church End Farm, and Manor Farm (1359486).</p> <p>An area of abnormal loads is proposed, which enables HGV's to mount pavement adjacent to the Site of a college and Benedictine abbey, St Mary's Church in Stow (1012976). As detailed in Paragraph 3.1.24 [APP-125] although this might result in a small number of temporary and ephemeral impacts to the setting of the Scheduled Monument, there would be an overall no change to the significance of the monument.</p> <p>The assessment identified minor visual impact at Coates medieval settlement and moated site (1016979), and concluded that there would be 'very minor changes to elements, or to</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>significance (or the ability to appreciate it) due to changes to setting', resulting in impacts of a Negligible magnitude (Paragraphs 3.3.11 to 3.3.14 [APP-125]).</p> <p>The Heritage Statement within C6.3.13.5 ES Appendix 13.5 [APP-125 to APP-128] did not conclude there would be any long-term potential structural damage to any designated heritage assets or buildings considered to have a historical importance (i.e. recorded as a locally listed heritage asset) as part of the Scheme.</p>
SPC-05			<p>"Island Green Power, and their consultants, who include Lizlake and Lanpro, have consulted with the residents of Stow Parish and with SPC during the Phase 1 and Phase 2 consultations conducted prior to Cottam Solar Project's submission to the Planning Inspectorate. We are pleased to see that some amendments to the plans have been made based on these consultations.</p> <p>The documentation submitted to PINS is, inevitably, very thorough, very detailed and of a technical nature that severely challenges a layperson. It is not easy to find one's way through the documentation and requires a great deal of</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that an Application seeking a Development Consent Order is technical in nature. The Applicant points the Party, and members of the public more broadly, to C6.5_A ES Non-Technical Summary</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>time and energy on the part of local residents. Given the potential dramatic impact of the proposals on local people they want to understand the impact upon themselves individually and on their community. The volume and complexity of, and lack of a layperson's perspective in, the documentation has rendered the submission impenetrable to many people. In this respect, we consider the overall consultation to be inadequate and prejudicial to residents' interests. Furthermore, these documents contain information which was not included even at a summary level in the pre-application consultations, but which is of great importance to residents."</p>	<p>Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C6.5_A] which provides a non-technical summary of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The Applicant furthermore acknowledges that the pre-application consultations were focused predominantly on the Scheme's design and its potential environmental impacts. Nonetheless, the Applicant is confident that the level of consultation conducted, as described in C5.1 Consultation Report [APP-021] is sufficient. This is corroborated by the positive Adequacy of Consultation Responses [AOC-001 to AOC-024] by each of the host and neighbouring local authorities.</p>
SPC-06			<p>"We are pleased to note from the EIS Chapter 14 page 12 that Green Lane, which is a popular public right of way, is no longer proposed as a construction route, and less panels are now proposed alongside it. However, the developers have proposed that Green Lane is retained as an access route for the operational phase of the project. We are strongly opposed to its use in this way, for the same reasons of unsuitability and negative environmental impact, given in opposing its use during the construction phase.</p>	<p>As detailed in Table 4.2 of C6.3.14.1 ES Appendix 14.1 Transport Assessment [APP-134], Green Lane will only be used for operational vehicle access and not during construction of the Scheme. Access is only required a handful of times per month to check on equipment</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>The intended use of some fields, such as sites with archaeological remains e.g., those at East Farm, has been changed from solar panels to wildlife habitat. A new permissive walking route is proposed which is welcome, but not at the expense of other routes such as Green Lane as mentioned above.</p> <p>It would also appear that our concerns have been heard in relation to some of the fields surrounding the houses adjacent to Ingham Road and Green Lane, which are no longer included. This is a considerable relief to the residents, and we are appreciative of this amendment to the plans.</p> <p>Other aspects of the consultation feedback have not been incorporated. These, and additional information made available since the consultations, form the basis for the points raised in this submission."</p>	<p>(see paragraph 5.22 of [APP-134]). This will be undertaken by a LGV (car or van) and not by HGVs.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the appreciation of the Party.</p> <p>The Applicant points the party to its consultation response to issue reference 'FPM-02' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>
SPC-07	Climate Change OEM: Waste		<p>"We note that several respondents to the Consultations have raised questions concerning the life-cycle carbon benefits of the Cottam Solar Project. A proper assessment of this would include the carbon footprints of the material sourcing, equipment manufacture, construction, operation, eventual removal and recycling of the panels and other equipment, and the reinstatement of the countryside. We are not aware that such an assessment has been created or provided and feel strongly that the project should only be allowed to proceed when it has been proven to provide a significant and clearly quantified benefit. A "hoped-for benefit" or a reliance on "future technology yet to be invented" is not an adequate response."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and refers the Party to paragraph 7.5.4 of C6.2.7_A ES Chapter 7 Climate Change Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C6.2.7_A] where it is anticipated that the PV panels will be sourced from China or a country of similar distance from the UK. Therefore, the Applicant has noted and accounted for the sourcing of panels within its assessment and that the manufacture and transport of products will likely be the largest</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>sources of GHG emissions from the Scheme.</p> <p>Paragraphs 7.4.3 and 7.4.6 of C6.2.7_A ES Chapter 7 Climate Change Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C6.2.7_A] explain how direct emissions from activities taking place within the Sites, indirect emissions from activities outside the Site and embodied carbon within construction materials are all considered as part of the GHG impact assessment (see Section 7.8 of C6.2.7_A ES Chapter 7 Climate Change Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C6.2.7_A]) across the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning.</p> <p>The solar panels will be decommissioned, disassembled, and removed from the Sites for waste management, of which it is assumed 75-82.6% will be recycled as set out in paragraph 20.5.5 and 20.5.10 of C6.2.20 ES Chapter 20</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>Waste [APP-055]. Solar panels are predominantly made from recyclable materials such as the metal frames, mounting structures, and glass facing panes. There is also an emerging industry for recycling and reusing the internal fittings and electrical equipment within solar panels (see paragraph 20.7.29).</p>
SPC-08			<p>"We are concerned to note that questions concerning the effects of the project on food production and employment opportunity in the agricultural sector, and on industries such as tourism, have not been replied to, nor have we found an assessment of these issues in the documentation. The combined effect on the local supply of housing and accommodation that the developer states is needed during the construction phase, outstrips the current availability within a 30 min and 60 min transport time. This is another negative impact on the local community, adding to the carbon footprint impact and traffic congestion that has not been adequately addressed within the consultation documents."</p>	<p>The Applicant points the party to its agricultural employment response to issue reference 'UPC-08' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The Applicant also points the party to its food production response to issue reference 'MGBPC-02' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>Impacts on the local supply of housing and on temporary</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>accommodation has been assessed across the Local Impact Area (Bassetlaw and West Lindsey districts) as a whole in Section 18.7 of C6.2.18 ES Chapter 18 Socio Economics Tourism and Recreation [APP-053]. A 30- or 60-minute travel time has not been assessed. Paragraphs 18.7.33-18.7.37 demonstrates how the construction workforce can be accommodated in temporary or permanent accommodation without a significant adverse effect on accommodation availability for local people or tourists and visitors.</p> <p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been prepared to support the application within C6.3.14.2_A ES Appendix 14.2 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/EX1/C6.3.14.2_A]. This will be secured through Requirement 15 in C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				The outline CTMP provides a framework for the management of construction vehicle movements to and from the Scheme, to ensure that the effects of the temporary construction phase on the local highway network are minimised and made acceptable.
SPC-09			<p>"We have major concerns about the impact of traffic for the construction phase. The timeframe of which for all of the projects will total nearly 5 years for local residents.</p> <p>The proposed route for 20% of the Heavy Goods Vehicles for the Cottam 1 West solar fields is northwards from the A1500 in Sturton by Stow along the B1241 through the centre of Stow to access point 13 at the end of Cotgarth Lane/Stone Lane in Willingham. In addition, the Cottam Battery Storage unit requires 3000 HGV deliveries. These may follow the same route, depending on the battery storage solution adopted. There are also five very long, heavy and voluminous Abnormal Loads carrying transformers to the substation at the end of Cotgarth Lane, and 75 or more trips carrying 30 tonne cable drums.</p> <p>The five transformers would each weigh 157 tonnes, and with their transporter would have a combined weight of 249 tonnes.</p> <p>The HGVs and Abnormal Loads going to the cable route access points 114, 115 and 119, and possibly to cable access 116, 117 and 118, are also planned to travel along this route. The Abnormal Loads for the cable route carry 30 Tonne cable drums and are 26m long.</p>	<p>Just a small number of HGVs associated with the construction of Cottam 1 West use the B1241. Table 6.3 of the C6.3.14.1 ES Appendix 14.1 Transport Assessment [APP-134] indicates that this will be as low as two HGVs per day on average. Paragraph 6.24 of the Transport Assessment states <i>"As this route is through the settlements of Stow and Sturton by Stow, smaller vehicles will be used to deliver equipment to these accesses. Again, HGV movement will be managed via a booking system"</i>.</p> <p>As set out in the Paragraph 2.10 of the C6.3.14.2_A ES Appendix 14.2 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>All the vehicles mentioned above, travelling to the Substation, the Cottam 1 West solar fields, and the three cable route accesses, are routed through the centre of Stow village, and in doing so pass immediately adjacent to private houses and to the Scheduled Monument of St Mary's Church. We have not found any assessment of the effects of the proposed repeated passages of very heavy vehicles on the foundations of the Scheduled Monument, and on the private houses bordering the route. There have been no structural assessments or recognition by the developers that the proposed routes in this area are wholly inappropriate for this size and volume of traffic. In regard to the very real possibility of structural damage to the neighbouring properties including listed buildings, the Applicant's proposals are silent on who will own and maintain the liability for this over the duration of the project's entire lifespan (including decommissioning)."</p>	<p>[EN010133/EX1/C6.3.14.2_A] the cable route will be built out in sections, with each access only used for approximately 90 days. During this period, there would be around eight HGV deliveries on an average day by tipper truck. There would also be a small number of cable route deliveries which would constitute an abnormal load.</p> <p>The route has been assessed and is appropriate for HGV use, with no HGV restrictions.</p> <p>All construction vehicle movements will be managed through the C6.3.14.2_A ES Appendix 14.2 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/EX1/C6.3.14.2_A].</p> <p>Any abnormal load movement will be escorted and will be subject to careful traffic management, which will be agreed with Lincolnshire Police.</p> <p>Abnormal load specialists 'Wynns' have prepared a report detailing the required movements and</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				management measures. This also includes swept path analysis of the vehicle movements. This is shown in Appendix F of the C6.3.14.1 ES Appendix 14.1 Transport Assessment [APP-134] and summarised in Section 7 of the Transport Assessment.
SPC-10			<p>"The Access and the Transport Management Plans are all dated January 2023, and as such were not available for residents to comment on in the Phase 1 and 2 consultations.</p> <p>We are concerned in general about the Transport Management reports. These are Chapter 14 "Transport and Access" of the Environmental Statement, Appendix 14.1 "Transport Assessment", and Appendix 14.2 "Construction Traffic Management Plan."</p>	The Applicant notes this comment and welcomes comments from Interested Parties on the documents submitted January 2023 over the course of the Examination.
SPC-11			<p>"The summary report in Chapter 14 includes the "Study Area" for the routings of construction traffic to the solar fields and uses these routes for the Safety and the Delay assessments, but the routes for access to Cottam 1 West do not include the B1241. At 14.7.22 the rationale given for this is that as it is calculated that there will be an average of only 1 HGV a day using that route it is scoped out of the assessment. SPC finds this approach unacceptable, as the B1241 passes through the centre of Stow, the village where most of the residents of our Parish live, and past the Sturton by Stow Primary School, which many of the children in our parish attend. The B1241 is included in the construction routes referred to in Appendix 14.1 – it is included on the map at Fig 6.3 and paras 6.23 and 6.24 acknowledge that there will be a requirement for some HGVs to use that route to Access points 10, 11 and 13. Para 14.7.60</p>	<p>Just a small number of HGVs associated with the construction of Cottam 1 West use the B1241. Table 6.3 of the C6.3.14.1 ES Appendix 14.1 Transport Assessment [APP-134] indicates that this will be as low as two HGVs per day on average.</p> <p>This low level of HGV does not meet the thresholds for detailed</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			acknowledges that the B1241 through Stow village will form part of the cable corridor construction route to accesses 114 and 115 possibly 119 (confusingly referred to in 14.7.65 as 14, 15 and 19) Again SPC finds it unacceptable that consideration of that part of the route is scoped out of table 14.24 showing effects during construction."	<p>assessment in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>However, the route has been assessed and is appropriate for HGV use, with no HGV restrictions.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.24 of the Transport Assessment states "As this route is through the settlements of Stow and Sturton by Stow, smaller vehicles will be used to deliver equipment to these accesses. Again, HGV movement will be managed via a booking system".</p> <p>All construction vehicle movements will be managed through the C6.3.14.2_A ES Appendix 14.2 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/EX1/C6.3.14.2_A].</p>
SPC-12			"In chapter 14, the traffic associated with the construction of the solar fields is assessed and compared with base loadings on the roads now and predicted loadings in the future. Assessments include those of Accidents and Safety, Driver Delay and Pedestrian and Cyclist Amenity and Delay. However, the traffic associated with the cable route is excluded from this comparison, as it is predicted to last for "only" 90 working days per access. 90 working days per access is over four months, but this is deemed acceptable (by people who don't live here!). We understand that 'Temporary' means that the work lasts for	<p>It is expected that Access 114 and 115 will be accessed vis the B1241. Accesses 116, 117 and 118 will be accessed through the Cottam 1 Site.</p> <p>As set out in the Paragraph 2.10 of the C6.3.14.2_A ES Appendix 14.2</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>less than 6 months, but cable accesses are proposed at separations of 1km along the whole route, so for local residents the cumulative effect will last far longer.</p> <p>The B1241 is of particular concern in this respect, as it passes through the villages of Stow and Normanby en route to cable accesses 114 and 115 just north of Stow, to access 119 in Kexby, and possibly to access 116, 117 and 118 in Willingham as well (the map in Figure 5.7 of the CTMP in Appendix 14.2 (APP/C6.3.14.2) shows B1241 as the route , though this is inconsistent with the description of the routes at 5.16 where it states they will be accessed by internal routes. This anomaly needs to be clarified).</p> <p>The combination of cable route traffic to these accesses will last for much longer than 90 working days – a year or more is more likely from the information supplied in the developers own proposals, therefore it is not acceptable to label the cable route work as “Temporary” and use that designation to exclude the cable route traffic from the Safety and Delay assessments.”</p>	<p>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/EX1/C6.3.14.2_A] the cable route will be built out in sections, with each access only used for approximately 90 days. During this period, there would be around eight HGV deliveries on an average day by tipper truck. There would also be a small number of cable route deliveries which would constitute an abnormal load.</p> <p>All construction vehicle movements will be managed through the C6.3.14.2_A ES Appendix 14.2 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/EX1/C6.3.14.2_A]</p> <p>Any abnormal load movement will be escorted and will be subject to careful traffic management, which will be agreed with Lincolnshire Police.</p> <p>The temporary use of the cable route corridor does not meet the thresholds for detailed assessment in the Environmental Statement.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				However, the route has been assessed and is appropriate for HGV use, with no HGV restrictions.

Sturton by Stow Parish Council [AS-018] [AS-038]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SSPC2-01	The Scheme Cumulative Development	Cumulative Impact	Sturton by Stow Parish Council wishes to register the following observations for Cottam Solar Project. In particular Cottam 1 South. We would make note that we are not against solar PV per se; but the sheer scale and mass of the five projects in the area begs the question whether this is sustainable in the long-term considering the huge amount of land required for all of the projects; Cottam, West Burton, Gate Burton, Tillbridge Solar and Luminous Energy (Stow Park).	Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] . Cumulative effects assessments for each topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with the NSIPs identified in paragraph 2.5.9 of C6.2.2 ES Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037] . This assessment is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.
SSPC2-02	Planning Policy	Conformity to policy	We would also wish the Inspectorate to note that the Sturton by Stow and Stow Neighbourhood Plan, which was Made in May 2022 and is positively prepared regarding renewable energy, is for residential scale renewables. The NP steering group could not have realistically be expected to have foreseen applications for commercial solar farms of any scale; let alone the five proposals currently at differing stages of application. Therefore, the note in the developer's application, which seems to confer a positive stance	The Applicant respectfully disagrees and considers that the Scheme is in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan as set out in Appendix 4 of C7.5_A Planning Statement [EN010133/EX1/C7.5_A] .

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			to large commercial solar farm developments, is incorrect and should be dismissed.	
SSPC2-03	The Application	Examination process	The overwhelming number of documents is not only time consuming but also difficult to compare information. The number of plans illustrating details are difficult and awkward to read. Does the Planning Inspectorate recognise that many people may have difficulty in accessing the information?	The Applicant notes this comment. Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] .
SSPC2-04	The Proposal	Compulsory Purchase Orders	Our main focus is the draft Consent for Development Order (Rev A). 1. The whole Cottam site (1, 2, 3a and 3b) within the boundary marked in red and coloured pink is potentially subject to compulsory purchase at any point within 5 years of the Order being signed. The inference from Island Green Power (IGP) is that landowners have already agreed to lease their land for PV solar panels. Why does the draft Order need to include leased land in a compulsory purchase option?	The Applicant's preference is to enter into voluntary agreements with all landowners within the Order limits. Negotiations and consultation with landowners on the Sites and Cable Route Corridor have been undertaken throughout the pre-application process, as detailed in paras. 9.1.24-9.1.34 of C5.1 Consultation Report [APP-021] . That notwithstanding, compulsory acquisition powers are being sought to ensure the deliverability of this nationally significant infrastructure project where voluntary land agreements are not able to be secured. The justification for the use of compulsory acquisition powers is set out within sections 7 and 8 of the C4.1_A Statement of Reasons

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				Revision A [AS-013] . The Applicant considers the use of compulsory acquisition powers to be necessary and proportionate.
SSPC2-05	The Proposal	Compulsory Purchase Orders	2. There are no restrictions from compulsory purchase in the event that this project is subsequently sold to a new developer within the five-year timescale.	The Applicant notes this comment.
SSPC2-06	The Scheme	Biodiversity Net Gain	3. The ecological survey and PIER reports infer that a biodiversity net gain of 70-96% is achievable. "A detailed Biodiversity Net Gain assessment has been carried out to support the DCO application. It is concluded in Appendix 9.12 [EN010133/APP/C6.3.9.12] of the ES that the Scheme 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". However, there is insufficient detail to demonstrate how this may be achieved. The mitigation and compensation thus far described appears to be the least possible gain within the development footprint and fails to demonstrate the significant gains that could be realised that would also benefit local people and visitors, boosting the local economy. It also states that hedges/trees will be allowed to grow in order to enhance the biodiverse properties of the areas. "During pre-application consultation (14/02/2022) with Sturton by Stow Parish Council (SSPC), the presence of the River Till ecological restoration corridor was pointed out as an opportunity for BNG."- C6.3.9.12 ES Appendix 9.12 Bio Diversity Net Gain Report; Whilst the comments in this report are encouraging to achieve BNG, the DCO application is at odds with the proposed enhancements with largescale hedge and tree removal.	The Applicant respectfully disagrees. C6.2.9 ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] demonstrates that biodiversity net gain will be achieved. This will be secured through the management and ecological monitoring prescriptions contained within C7.3 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010133/EX1/C7.3_A] and through a biodiversity net gain strategy, which are secured through Requirements 7 and 9 in Schedule 2 of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B] . In certain locations where accesses do not exist, some very minor hedgerow removal is necessary to

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				accommodate access roads between fields, land parcels and solar panel areas. This removal is set out in the Hedgerow Removal Plans in Appendix C of C7.3_A Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Revision A [EN010133/EX1PEX/C7.3_A] . This removal will involve only very short sections of hedgerow to accommodate internal access roads and will not involve loss of trees, in particular trees protected under any Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs).
SSPC2-07	Landscape Impacts	Hedgerow Removal	4. The Consent Order specifies a significant number of hedges be removed. Some of the hedgerows which are marked to be removed are classed as potentially important as well as important. Hedges are a priority habitat, and every effort should be made to retain them, especially. The developer should be clearly demonstrating why it is necessary to remove any hedgerow and clearly show how they will over-compensate for losses. The cumulative effect of such a large reduction in hedges is not adequately documented. Their removal will have significant impact on the ability of surface water to be retained in the locale and will potentially induce localised flooding and water retention issues. Document EN010133-000112-C2.11 Important Hedgerows.	The Applicant points the Party to its hedgerow and tree related response to issue reference 'LCC-28' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .
SSPC2-08	Landscape Impacts	Hedgerow Removal	"5. We particularly OBJECT to the removal of the following specific hedgerows as stated in the Development Consent Order Rev A and document EN010133-000112-C2.11 Important Hedgerows Plan;	In certain locations where accesses do not exist, some very minor hedgerow removal is necessary to

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>H275 Thorpe Lane – This hedge is located along the southern boundary of Thorpe Lane and is not within the development area. The road is bounded by ditches each side. The highway is adequate for large agricultural machinery and large grain transport HGV's; The hedgerow is largely separated from the road by a wide grass verge and ditch and there is no gain in removal of this particular hedgerow</p> <p>H278, H279, H280 The removal of these hedgerows will have significant visual impact from Sturton by Stow and for the residents of Fleets Lane Cottages. The hedges form a boundary to fields which will not be part of Cottam 1. The advantage of windbreak from the hedging to reduce soil erosion as well as absorbing surface water will be compromised, let alone the disaster for wildlife which relies on this habitat. There appears to be no pertinent reason for removal of these hedgerows."</p>	<p>accommodate access roads between fields, land parcels and solar panel areas. This removal is set out in the Hedgerow Removal Plans in Appendix C of C7.3_A Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Revision A [EN010133/EX1PEX/C7.3_A]. This removal will involve only very short sections of hedgerow to accommodate internal access roads and will not involve loss of trees, in particular trees protected under any Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). It is not anticipated that the removal of any section of hedgerows H275, H278, H279 and H280 will be required.</p>
SSPC2-09	Landscape Impacts	Tree Removal	<p>6. The Consent Order makes reference to trees, including those protected by TPO, being removed. Which trees are subject to being removed? The surrounding area has very little tree cover and the destruction of these trees is more than unfortunate. Tree removal should be demonstrably last resort with a clear rationale, and no veteran trees removed under any circumstances. All tree removal should be significantly over-compensated for. The issue of surface water flooding will be exacerbated by the reduction of any trees.</p>	<p>In certain locations where existing accesses do not exist, some very minor hedgerow removal is necessary to accommodate access roads between fields, land parcels and solar panel areas. This removal is set out in the Hedgerow Removal Plans in Appendix C of C7.3_A Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Revision A</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				[EN010133/EX1PEX/C7.3_A]. This removal will involve only very short sections of hedgerow to accommodate internal access roads and will not involve loss of trees, in particular trees protected under any Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs).
SSPC2-10	Landscape Impacts	Hedgerow Removal	7. Where are the proposed 20 kilometres of hedgerow to be established? The drawings are difficult to study, therefore it is impossible to comment adequately.	The proposed hedgerows are clearly set out in C6.4.8.16.1_A to C6.4.8.16.10_A Landscape and Ecology Mitigation and Enhancement Plans [EN010133/EX1/C6.4.8.16.1_A-C6.4.8.16.10_A].
SSPC2-11			8. The consultation reports make great effort to acknowledge the creation of a permissive path – only one – this is being created to mitigate the closure of a public footpath in Stow. Surely there is much more scope to create walking routes, even if they are permissive for the duration of the project? There is an opportunity to create footpaths, permissive or PROW to add value for residents and visitors alike. Footpath Stur/80/1 will be impacted when Thorpe Lane is closed as per the public rights of way plan C2.5 Public Rights of Way Plan – see page 14.	The Applicant notes this comment. It is not proposed for Thorpe Lane to be closed. C6.3.14.2_A ES Appendix 14.2 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/EX1/C6.3.14.2_A] anticipates that there will be 20 movements of construction vehicles per day at Cottam 1 South, for which Thorpe Lane is one of the two construction accesses.
SSPC2-12			9. Sturton by Stow and Stow Parish Councils have, independently, asked for a permissive path to be created which would run between Thorpe Bridge along the ridge of the River Till riverbank over the Bridge on Ingham Lane	The Applicant notes this comment.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>(Squires Bridge) to the northern end of Green Lane. This should be achievable with little impact to the development itself since IGP have already stated they will not be developing within 10m of the river bank. Although IGP have seemingly used this as an opportunity to absolve themselves of riparian responsibilities, which they must not be able to do.</p>	<p>C6.2.8 ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] (the 'LVIA') looks to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the landscape character of the Study Area and to reduce the visibility of the Scheme from residential properties and other public vantage points including transport routes, public footpaths, permissive footpaths and green lane network. This mitigation is aimed to benefit the community as a whole to enhance their way of life as well as green infrastructure (see paras. 8.1.1 and 8.8.3). Public consultation has also taken account of landscape and visual matters (see paras. 8.2.8 and 8.4.20). The landscape mitigation measures seek to provide new planting to mitigation the potential impacts and effects of glint and glare (see paras. 8.2.10, 8.4.44, 8.8.8, 8.9.19 and 8.9.20).</p> <p>As stated in Table 12.1 of C5.1 Consultation Report [APP-021] on p147: 'The Applicant has explored alternative permissive path routes</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				[including along the western bank of the River Till] but these proved to be incompatible with existing farming activities, or required land beyond the Applicant's control.'
SSPC2-13	Landscape	Written Scheme of Planting	10. There is little information regarding actual schemes of planting apart from maps which are impossible to read; A written scheme of planting would be useful. Where are the wildflower meadows, swales and other 'net gains' to be created? Will there be an opportunity for largescale maps to be made available for each local area? The difficulty accessing detail makes adequate comment impossible. The developer has an opportunity here to showcase how large scale solar can deliver significant beneficial outcomes for nature in an area that is nature depleted. They could create new habitats over and above that required and could provide a valuable asset for local people to enjoy, which could attract visitors to the area with associated knock-on economic benefits. This development should not be approved unless the developer clearly demonstrates that they can and intend to do this.	<p>C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B], provides (in Requirements 7 and 9 of Schedule 2) that, before development commences, a landscape and ecological mitigation plan and a biodiversity net gain strategy must be approved by the local planning authority. The landscape and ecological mitigation plan "must be substantially in accordance with the outline landscape and ecological mitigation plan".</p> <p>C7.3_A Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010133/EX1/C7.3_A] refers to C6.4.8.16.1_A to C6.4.8.16.10_A Landscape and Ecology Mitigation and Enhancement Plans [EN010133/EX1/C6.4.8.16.1_A-C6.4.8.16.10_A] which sets out the</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				proposed areas of planting and other ecological enhancement.
SSPC2-14	Agricultural Land	Reinstatement of Agricultural Land	11. Sturton by Stow Parish Council has concerns that not only a huge area of land will be lost to agriculture for a significant period of time but that the area will be changed beyond recognition by the removal of hedgerows and trees. We require assurance that this land will be returned to agriculture once solar PV is no longer on site, other than those areas where habitats have been created as alluded to in point 10.	<p>Once the Scheme ceases to operate, it will be decommissioned. Reversion of the land for agricultural use will occur as part of the decommissioning process, minimising any risk of loss of agricultural land extent or quality. Decommissioning activities will reinstate the agricultural land, as set out in section 2.1 of C7.2 Outline Decommissioning Statement [APP-338] which is secured by Requirement 21 in Schedule 2 of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B].</p> <p>With regard to effects to hedgerows, the Applicant points the Party to its ecology and landscape response to issue reference 'LCC-28' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SSPC2-15	Transport and Access	Closure and Management of Roads	12. The closure or traffic management of some of the roads, even temporarily, will have significant impacts on residents. We understand traffic management, due to the additional high volume, will be necessary because of the nature of the development, please do not underestimate the flow of traffic along A1500. This is a major route and diversions will add significant time and distance for commuters. The potential closure (Streets Map Plan) of B1241 in Stow is concerning. This may be rural Lincolnshire but we still have many vehicles on our roads. The increase in volume of traffic during construction will have an impact on our road infrastructure and the cumulative effects of multiple construction sites will have a severe effect on local residents. Many of our local roads have either narrow or no public pavement.	The Applicant points the Party to its transport and access response to issue response reference '7A-14' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
SSPC2-16	Contributions	Community Benefit Community Liaison Group	13. The aspect of restitution and compensation has not been addressed. There is note of creating a community group, although detail is scant. During the initial consultation periods residents were encouraged to bring forth ideas for community projects but it would seem that this has been disregarded and no genuine discussions have been held. We had suggested that our public buildings could be fitted with their own solar PV panel.	In accordance with requirement 4 in Schedule 2 of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B], the undertaker must establish a community liaison group, with terms of reference approved by the relevant planning authority.
SSPC2-17	Contributions	Community Benefit	14. We would wish to see a significant investment prior to and during the construction phase as well as ongoing contributions during the lifetime of the project. We would expect somewhere in the region of £10,000,000 (£10 million) as an initial funding donation and then regular payments annually, to be used for community benefit for those communities impacted by the Cottam solar project. There is precedence for community compensation set by other solar projects and windfarms such as Triton Knoll. We see no reason to not insist on community restitution and compensation. Our	The Applicant is committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund – see paragraph 4.8.1 of C7.5_A Planning Statement [EN010133/EX1/C7.5_A]. This fund will be available for community-based benefits such as (but not

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			residents will be subject to disruption during the construction phases as well as the ongoing maintenance visits and visual impacts for at least 35 years.	limited to) community-led energy related projects.

Health and Safety Executive [AS-019]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
HSE-01	Other Environmental Matters: Public Health/ Major Accidents and Disasters	Battery safety management plan (BSMP)	<p>We have explained previously to other draft DCOs, there is no statutory requirement to consult HSE in relation to a Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) as HSE does not provide comment on them.</p> <p>So therefore HSE, is requesting that Schedule 2 Requirement 6 and any other references to HSE consultation/approval of the BSMP are removed from the Development Consent Order ahead of your meeting on the 5 September 2023, as stated above there is no statutory requirement to consult HSE and HSE would not provide any comments on them.</p>	<p>The words 'the Health and Safety Executive,' have been removed from Schedule 2, Requirement 6, Paragraph 3 of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B].</p>

7000 Acres [AS-020]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
7A2-01	The Scheme		We represent a large number of concerned residents. We oppose this and the other three solar NSIPs because of the irreparable harm to the traditional local economy, communities, and landscape.	The Applicant notes this comment.
7A2-02	Environmental Assessment		The Applicant's EIA is byzantine, in many areas it lacks tangible evidence and frequently draws flawed conclusions. Furthermore, during open days the Applicant stated that if they received Consent, they would sell-on the project. Therefore, the dDCO must be robust to ensure that Application minimises damage to the local community and the environment.	The Applicant notes this comment.
7A2-03	Generating capacity	Whether there should be a cap.	<p>2. Generating Capacity</p> <p>The dDCO does not cap the generating capacity of the Cottam NSIP. 7000 Acres believes that the generating capacity must be capped so that improvements in technology can be used to reduce the considerable impact of this scheme, and the other 3 solar NSIPs, on the local environment.</p>	The Applicant had not included an upper limit for the generating capacity of the solar PV panels in the DCO. An upper limit is not deemed necessary for planning purposes and means that the Applicant will be able to take advantage of any technological improvements that may arrive prior to construction which enable increases the MW output of the Scheme. It is noted that the Scheme must be constructed, operated, and maintained in accordance with the fixed parameters (e.g. relating to size and external appearance) that have been assessed in the

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058]. For further details, please see paragraph 1.4.4 of the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-017] which set out the justification for this approach.
7A2-04	Battery Storage	Battery Storage Safety Management Plan	<p>3. Battery Storage System</p> <p>3.1 Battery Safety Management</p> <p>Requirement 6.(1) states:</p> <p>"Work Nos. 2 and 3 must not commence until a battery storage safety management plan has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>(2) The battery storage safety management plan must be substantially in accordance with the outline battery storage safety management plan."</p> <p>The word "substantially" must be removed. This is a safety plan and so must be complied with in full.</p> <p>The LPA is unlikely to have the specialist knowledge to approve the plan. Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue and the Environment Agency must be consulted as a BESS thermal runaway would be a major incident and result in substantial amounts of polluted firewater being present on the site.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and considers that the provisions of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B] are adequate to secure the safe operation of the battery storage system.</p> <p>C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B], provides, in Requirement 6(2) that the relevant planning authority must consult with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue and the Environment Agency before approving the battery storage safety management plan.</p>
7A2-05	The Scheme	Associated Development	<p>3.2 Associated Development</p> <p>The dDCO identifies a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS). There is insufficient evidence for the Examining Authority to conclude that the BESS</p>	<p>The Applicant points the party to its response regarding associated development reference '7A-45' as</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
		Nature of the BESS	<p>would be Associated Development or an aim in itself. As the Applicant has adopted a Rochdale Envelope, there is limited information available about the BESS. Amongst other things the following details are unclear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any indications as to the total power of the BESS (rated in megawatts) • Any indications as to the storage capacity and duration of storage (rated in megawatt hours) • Sufficient evidence regarding the network and how the PV cells will be connected to the BESS • Any explanation over the energy balancing role of the BESS and energy import from the National Grid. These features are discussed in publicity material but not in the dDCO, so will they be a feature of the BESS? <p>It is currently unclear if the BESS is Associated Development or could be viewed as an aim in itself. This latter point would apply if the BESS was used to import and trade energy with the National Grid. As a solar farm has a limited operating envelope, using the BESS to trade power outside the limited operating envelope of the PV cells should be viewed as a separate development.</p> <p>7000Acres will provide evidence in our Written Representations that the BESS has the potential to provide a substantial additional income to the solar park operator, when the solar panels are not generating. As the Consent will be for operating a "generating station", revenue operations when the scheme is not capable of generating power should be viewed as a separate system and consent for a BESS sought through the Infrastructure Planning (Electricity Storage Facilities) Order 2020.</p>	<p>contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>It is unclear on the relationship between the generating and storage capability of the project. In particular why this project requires such a large BESS to be co-located with the PV panels, and if actually required, why it is not located remotely on a brownfield site, such as co-located with the grid connection?</p> <p>It is noted that the dDCO does not limit the upper limit of the storage capacity of the BESS. This is at variance with previous schemes. For example, the Little Crow scheme limited the power of the BESS in the DCO to 90 MW (Appendix 4 – Schedule 1, definition of Works 2A and 2B6). If the Applicant provides sufficient evidence for the Examining Authority to conclude the BESS is associated development, then the storage capacity should be limited to ensure it is “proportionate to the nature and scale of the principal development”.</p> <p>7000 Acres propose that the dDCO could limit the BESS in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power - “The BESS within the scheme shall not exceed [XXX] MW of power output as calculated by the sum of the stated power output on any included battery cells.” • Capacity – “The BESS within the scheme shall not exceed [XXX] MWh of capacity as calculated by the sum of the stated capacity on any included battery cells.” • Use - “The BESS within the scheme shall only be charged using power generated by the principal development constituted by Schedule 1 Work No. 1.” 	

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land available for Schedule 1 Work No 2 could be constrained in area and volume. <p>7000 Acres has a number of additional concerns regarding the BESS that will be addressed in Written Representations.</p>	
7A2-06	Landscape and Ecological Management Plan		<p>4. Landscape and Ecological Management Plan</p> <p>Requirement 7. (2) states:</p> <p>The landscape and ecological management plan must be substantially in accordance with the outline landscape and ecological management plan.</p> <p>The word "substantially" should be removed. As a general point, the Applicant frequently uses the word "substantially" in the dDCO. This implies that some elements of a requirement are optional and at the whim of the Applicant.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and considers that the provisions of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B] are adequate to secure the proposed landscape and ecological measures.</p>
7A2-07	Felling of trees and hedgerow removal		<p>5. Felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows</p> <p>Requirements 38 and 39 state:</p> <p>"38.—(1) The undertaker may fell or lop any tree or shrub near any part of the authorised development or cut back its roots, if it reasonably believes it to be necessary to do so to prevent the tree or shrub from—"</p> <p>"39.—(1) The undertaker may fell or lop any tree that is subject to a tree preservation order within or overhanging land within the Order limits or cut back its roots, if it reasonably believes it to be necessary to do so in order to prevent the tree from obstructing or interfering with the construction, maintenance or operation of the authorised development or any apparatus used in connection with the authorised development."</p>	<p>With regard to effects to hedgerows, the Applicant points the Party to its ecology and landscape response to issue reference 'LCC-28' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>The current wording of the dDCO would allow the Applicant to remove all hedgerows and trees they believe to be necessary without any checks and balances.</p> <p>In the opinion of 7000 Acres, the dDCO should be revised to state that any lopping, pruning, felling or removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs should be in accordance with the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.</p>	
7A2-08	Decommissioning		<p>6. Decommissioning</p> <p>As with other aspects of this application, the Examining Authority (and local residents) are deprived of evidence regarding decommissioning. No general framework for decommissioning is provided, or criteria against which successful decommissioning can be tested. There is no evidence that agricultural land will be returned to its original state.</p>	<p>As the Scheme will be decommissioned there will not be a permanent loss of agricultural land. Furthermore, decommissioning mitigation and site restoration measures are set out in C7.2 Outline Decommissioning Statement [APP-338] are secured by Requirement 21 in Schedule 2 of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B].</p>
7A2-09	Operation		<p>6.1 Period of Operation</p> <p>The dDCO does not stipulate an operational period for the solar farm and so it is not clear when the solar farm is likely to cease operations, and so it cannot be confirmed the land use is "temporary". The Applicant's PEIR states an operational period of "approximately 40 years". 7000Acres does not agree that 40 years is "temporary"; our view is supported by the</p>	<p>In response to concerns raised by the Examining Authority and interested parties regarding the Scheme being in place in perpetuity, the Applicant has amended Requirement 21 of Schedule 2 to the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 1 to require</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>Planning Inspector for the Lullington solar farm (The Planning Inspectorate, 2023):</p> <p>"Whilst the 40-year period may allow for the restoration of the soil structure and reduce the problems associated with nitrates usage, it appears to me, as it has done to other Inspectors at appeals cited by the Council, that 40 years would indeed constitute a generational change."</p> <p>The dDCO should limit the operational period to the lifespan of the original solar panels, i.e. circa 25 years</p>	<p>the Scheme to be decommissioned after 60 years. Paragraph 3.10.137 of draft NPS EN-3 states that the Secretary of State should ensure that outline plans for decommissioning the generating station and restoring the land have been put forward. An outline decommissioning statement forms part of the DCO application documents [APP-338] and decommissioning is secured by Requirement 21 of the DCO. Requirement 21 now states that <i>"The date of decommissioning must be no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning"</i>.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate that the operational lifetime of the Scheme should be limited to 25 years.</p>
7A2-10	Decommissioning		<p>6.3 Decommissioning Bond</p> <p>As the Applicant openly stated they will sell-on the project if their Application is successful, a Decommissioning Bond must be provided to</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider that this proposal would assist in securing the requirements of</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			ensure there are sufficient funds to decommission the scheme should the Applicant (or future operator) be financially unable to do so at the point required.	C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B]
7A2-11	Noise, glare, emissions		7. Noise, Glare and Emission Requirements 7000 Acres requests the Examining Authority to consider placing limits on noise, glare and emissions in the dDCO. This is due to the size of this project and the nearby three other solar NSIPs of a similar size. As the individual and cumulative effect of these schemes will be detrimental to residents' physical and mental health, we consider it appropriate to place these limitations on the Applicant.	The Applicant points the Party to its response on glint and glare assessments and mitigation to issue reference 'GG-02' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
7A2-12	Work No's		8. Work Nos The Work Nos do not limit the height of structures, such as solar PV panels. Other documentation identifies solar PV panels 4.5 metres high, which is excessive and totally unacceptable to the local community. The maximum height of the solar PV panels must be identified in the dDCO and limited to a height that has minimal local impact, such as a typical Lincolnshire hedge height of 2m.	The maximum heights of the solar modules are set out in C7.15_A Concept Design Parameters and Principles document [EN010133/EX1/C7.15_A] which is secured by Requirement 5 in Schedule 2 of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B].

Sturton by Stow and Stow Neighbourhood Planning Group [AS-021] [AS-039]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SSSPC2-01	The Scheme	Planning Policy	<p>This report sets out the work of the reconvened Sturton by Stow and Stow Neighbourhood Planning Group, who have been considering the proposals regarding the recent spate of applications for development of solar farms. There are now applications regarding: Cottam 1, 2 and 3; West Burton 1, 2 and 3; Gate Burton; Tillbridge Solar and Stow Park (Luminous), three of which affect our parishes, particularly Cottam 1. The Government's drive for a zero-carbon economy by 2050 is supported by the Parish Councils of Sturton by Stow and Stow but, the central part to achieving this goal is the right balance being achieved between the scale and location for renewable energy infrastructure and loss of our valued heritage, landscapes and biodiversity. These schemes must not overwhelm rural communities. Any development on this scale will create a major change for residents in the landscape. To help manage the impacts of renewable energy developments, Paragraphs 155 (a) and (b) of the NPPF state that Local Plans should be taken into account. The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2022 is not helpful regarding solar PV energy developments and therefore does not provide the framework for guiding such large-scale schemes.</p> <p>Our Neighbourhood Plan does not anticipate and was not written to incorporate concurrent large-scale applications for commercial solar PV farms. However, the aspirations of the residents in many relevant regards (eg. Conservation of heritage assets, enhancement of biodiversity, access to the countryside etc) are very clear in our Neighbourhood Plan, which was adopted, following a successful examination and referendum, in July 2022. The note in the developer's application, which seems to confer a positive stance to large commercial solar farm developments, is incorrect and should be dismissed.</p>	<p>The Applicant respectfully disagrees and considers that the Scheme is in accordance with local and national policies as set out in Appendix 4 of C7.5_A Planning Statement [EN010133/EX1/C7.5_A].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SSSPC2-02	The Scheme	Landscape Impacts	<p>The area</p> <p>The parishes of Sturton by Stow and Stow reside in the district of West Lindsey.</p> <p>As indicated in our Neighbourhood Profile; The East Midlands Regional Landscape Character Assessment (2010) places our Neighbourhood Area within the Character Area dubbed "Unwooded Vale", this includes almost the whole of the flat areas enclosed on the west by the floodplain valley of the river Trent and on the east by the limestone scarps and dip slopes of the Lincoln Edge. West Lindsey District Council's Landscape Character Appraisal Study (1999) presents more in-depth analysis of the geology of the parishes; The study endorses 14 different Landscape Characters which give strategies for specific areas and how to sustain and reinforce the environmental landscape of the area. The designated Sturton by Stow and Stow area is the Till Vale.</p> <p>There is a protected zone between close adjacent settlements, such as Stow and Sturton by Stow, to prevent coalescence and ensure that individual landscape settings are conserved.</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its landscape-related response to issue reference 'LAN-01' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>
SSSPC2-03	Cultural Heritage	Scheduled Monuments Listed Buildings Non-designated heritage assets	<p>Within our parishes, in the area covered by the Cottam and West Burton proposals for solar panels, there are three Scheduled Monuments. These are covered in Policy 6 of our Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site of a college and Benedictine abbey, St Mary's Church in Stow (1012976) • Coates medieval settlement and moated site (1016979); • Medieval Bishop's Palace and Deer Park (1019229). 	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its cultural heritage response to issue reference '7A-13' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The land east of Normanby Road, Stow is proposed to be used for the creation of a permissive path, as set</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>In paragraph 13.5.1 of the Environmental Statement: Chapter 13 Cultural Heritage it states: 'none of the scheduled monuments are located within any of the sites.'</p> <p>However, there are proposals for panels near to Coates and Stow Park. There are a number of Grade 1 and 2 listed buildings, on construction routes or cabling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Mary's Church (1146624) • St Edith's Church (1146742) • Stables and Pigeon Cote (1146735) and Threshing Barn (1064063), Church End Farm; • Manor Farm (1359486); <p>And buildings that are not listed, but are considered as historically significant locally;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Farm, Normanby; • The Cross Keys; • 2, Stow Park Road, Stow; • 3, Normanby Road, Stow. <p>The proposed construction route is over what is believed to be a ridge and furrow field to the east of the Normanby Road leaving Stow village.</p> <p>The proposed location of solar panels in the area around Coates cannot be seen in any way to "preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the historic settlements, listed buildings and their settings".</p>	<p>out in Work No 11 or Schedule 1 of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B], and not as a construction route.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SSSPC2-04	Transport and Access	Construction Phase	<p>Construction</p> <p>We would draw your attention to paragraph 13.5.1 of the Environmental Statement: Chapter 13 Cultural Heritage: 13.4.21 Paragraph 5.8.14 of NPS EN1, 13.4.22 Paragraph 5.8.15, and 13.7.12, which cover our heritage assets and construction routes.</p> <p>There are major concerns about the impact of the construction phase. The proposed route brings large vehicles through Stow, along Normanby Road, round some narrow bends before cutting across a ridge and furrow field. The narrow bends go past St Mary's, a Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>Section 13.8. – in particular 13.8.5 “The only potential direct physical impact to a designated heritage asset is the potential for damage to the wall of the churchyard at the Site of a college and Benedictine Abbey, St Mary's Church (NHLE 1012976) during construction. This is due to the fact that HGVs delivering abnormal loads will need to mount the pavement adjacent to the Scheduled Monument, but this can be mitigated by the close monitoring of these manoeuvres by a suitably qualified banksman to ensure that this potential adverse impact can be avoided.”</p> <p>Is this really adequate protection of a such an important site? Perhaps an alternate route should be sought.</p> <p>The large number of access points proposed means a high volume of construction and maintenance traffic is directed along narrow, minor roads and through villages to reach their destinations. This places the burden of traffic, including the permanent alteration of roads, onto surrounding residents. Traffic associated with the project could more appropriately be routed along internal roads constructed within the project area. Access via one or two entrances as close as possible to the larger public highways</p>	<p>The land east of Normanby Road, Stow is proposed to be used for the creation of a permissive path, as set out in Work No 11 or Schedule 1 of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B], and not as a construction route.</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its transport and access response to issue reference 'CPC-03' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>Appendix 7 of C6.3.14.1 ES Appendix 14.1 Transport Assessment [APP-134] provides a detailed plan of how the abnormal load will negotiate the bends within Stow.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			bounding the project area would transfer a lot of the nuisance from the surrounding, non-project areas to where it belongs – inside the project's boundaries. This proposal is eminently feasible – routing the construction lorries along internal roads is part and parcel of the proposals for Cottam 1 North and Cottam 1 West.	
SSSPC2-05	Biodiversity	Hedgerow removal	<p>Biodiversity</p> <p>Document EN010133-000112-C2.11 Important Hedgerows and the Development Consent Order Rev A. The removal of H275, H278, H279 and H280 is not supported. There appears to be no pertinent reason for removal of these particular, or indeed most, hedgerows. Construction traffic would be easily controlled by visual means; traffic lights or banksmen. Thorpe Lane, Sturton by Stow is used by large agricultural machinery and grain HGVs without problem. This road will be adequate without the need for hedgerow removal.</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its hedgerow removal response to issue response reference 'LCC-28' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the removal of any section of hedgerows H275, H278, H279 and H280 will be required.</p>
SSSPC2-06	Biodiversity	<p>Biodiversity Net Gain</p> <p>Access to Nature</p>	<p>We note the reports for Biodiversity Net Gain but despite demonstrating a large BNG for Cottam, which is to be applauded, most of it will not be accessible to be enjoyed by local people. The developer is missing the opportunity to showcase how large solar developments could enhance the lives of local people affected by such developments. By providing community access to nature that would improve their well-being and reconnect them to nature. There is the potential to create a large wetland alongside the river Till to the east of Sturton by Stow, which would enable locals and visitors to the area enjoy wildlife. This suggestion to re-create some of the lost wetland was made during the Consultation Periods in a meeting between Sturton by Stow and Stow Parish Councillors and Lanpro</p>	<p>The Scheme will also provide extensive areas of mitigation along the existing sections of footpaths and bridleways to enhance their amenity value and benefit the public as a whole as demonstrated in C6.2.8 ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			and Lizlake. Furthermore, it could potentially bring economic benefits too, drawing in new visitors to the area that would utilise local services.	
SSSPC2-07	PRoWs	Permissive Path	<p>Public Amenity Space</p> <p>One aspiration of our Neighbourhood Plan (see Policy 15) is the creation of new footpaths. Sturton by Stow and Stow Parish Councils have, independently, asked for a permissive path to be created which would run between Thorpe Bridge (Western side ideally) along the ridge of the River Till riverbank over the Bridge on Ingham Lane (Squires Bridge) to the northern end of Green Lane thence to its intersection with the B1241. See map below. We mentioned this in the meeting with Lanpro and Lizlake and pointed out that as the banks of the River Till are elevated by flood defences, they provide a raised platform on which to walk, and thus observe both the wildlife of the Till and see over the panels to the views beyond. This should be achievable but has not been adequately addressed by the developer.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>C6.2.8 ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] (the 'LVIA') looks to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the landscape character of the Study Area and to reduce the visibility of the Scheme from residential properties and other public vantage points including transport routes, public footpaths, permissive footpaths and green lane network. This mitigation is aimed to benefit the community as a whole to enhance their way of life as well as green infrastructure (see paras. 8.1.1 and 8.8.3). Public consultation has also taken account of landscape and visual matters (see paras. 8.2.8 and 8.4.20). The landscape mitigation measures seek to provide new planting to mitigation the potential impacts and effects of glint and glare (see paras. 8.2.10, 8.4.44, 8.8.8, 8.9.19 and 8.9.20).</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				As stated in Table 12.1 of C5.1 Consultation Report [APP-021] on p147: 'The Applicant has explored alternative permissive path routes [including along the western bank of the River Till] but these proved to be incompatible with existing farming activities, or required land beyond the Applicant's control.'
SSSPC2-08	Transport	Construction Traffic Impacts	Coates Lane and Green Lane (Stow) will effectively be lost due to Construction Traffic and blocked views due to the high panels planned too close to walking routes.	<p>As detailed in paragraph 6.23 and Table 6.3 of C6.3.14.1 ES Appendix 14.1 Transport Assessment [APP-134], Coates Lane will only be used for a 'small number of vehicles' during construction, with approximately 5 vehicle trips at peak.</p> <p>As detailed in Table 4.2 of C6.3.14.1 ES Appendix 14.1 Transport Assessment [APP-134], the Green Lane will only be used for operational vehicle access and not during construction of the Scheme.</p> <p>During the operation of the Scheme, access along Green Lane and Coates Lane is only required a handful of times per month to check on equipment (see paragraph 5.22 of</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>[APP-134]). This will be undertaken by a LGV (car or van) and not by HGVs.</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its landscape-related response to issue reference 'LAN-04' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>
SSSPC2-09	Community Benefits	Contributions	<p>Community Benefit</p> <p>During the initial consultation periods by Island Green Power, residents were encouraged to bring forth ideas for community projects but it would seem that this has been disregarded and, as far as we are aware, no genuine discussions have been held.</p> <p>There is scope for significant investment prior to and during the construction phase as well as ongoing contributions during the lifetime of the project. We would expect somewhere in the region of £10,000,000 (£10 million) as an initial funding donation and then regular payments annually. This would be managed and accessed by the communities affected by Cottam 1.</p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund – see paragraph 4.8.1 of C7.5_A Planning Statement [EN010133/EX1/C7.5_A]. This fund will be available for community-based benefits throughout the lifetime of the Scheme. The provision of the Community Benefit Fund itself does not form a part of the DCO Application, and therefore will be agreed separately between the Applicant and the fund's beneficiaries.</p>

Rebecca Allen [AS-022]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
RA2-01			There is a need to review the whole area for the impact that every solar farm will have on the communities that live here. It is unacceptable to review each individually as though they did not have a cumulative impact. To not review as a whole, is a failure of the planning inspectorate spirit and ethos, regardless of technical processes.	Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] . Cumulative effects assessments for each topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with the NSIPs identified in paragraph 2.5.9 of C6.2.2 ES Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037] . This assessment is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.

Emma Bailey [AS-023]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
EBA-01			<p>The site is planned to be the largest in the UK, affecting approx. 10000 acres of open rural landscape. That the majority of is used to grow food.</p> <p>According to DEFRA, all the land affected is good quality agricultural land, the majority being Grade 3a. With quality agricultural land such as this swiftly decreasing and with this site potentially being the largest in the UK, we object to such a large agricultural area being transformed in one location.</p>	<p>As set out in Table 19.10 of C6.2.19_A ES Chapter 19 Soils and Agriculture Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C6.2.19_A], 94.8% of the agricultural land resource within the Sites is ALC Grade 3b.</p>
EBA-02			<p>The substation sites have not been made clear in relation to size, staffing and contingency should any thing go wrong.</p>	<p>C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B], provides (in Requirements 7 and 14 of Schedule 2) that, before development commences, an operational environmental management plan must be approved by the local planning authority. The operational environmental management plan "<i>must be substantially in accordance with the outline operational environmental management plan</i>".</p> <p>C7.16 Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [APP-353] states that it seeks 'to provide a clear and consistent approach to the control of operational</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				and maintenance activities', including the substation sites.
EBA-03			Lithium-ion batteries are a very new, 'untested and potentially very hazardous technology'. There have been fires and explosions all over the world caused by Lithium-ion batteries. Our small local fire service will not have the facilities to deal with fires of this kind on this scale,	The Applicant notes this comment and considers that the provisions of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B] are adequate to secure the safe operation of the battery storage system.
EBA-04			The batteries will not be able to store the required amount of electricity that will impact the usage over the winter months when demand is at its highest. With this in mind, the environmental effects of mining the ingredients for these batteries is detrimental to climate change and does not outweigh the need for solar energy.	C7.11 Statement of Need [APP-350] sets out how battery energy storage supports the Scheme's contribution to meeting national energy policy.
EBA-05			How long do the developers estimate the construction period in total to last?, this includes preparing the site for development and the building the scheme itself. During this time how many additional HGV vehicles per day are expected, along with light goods vehicles, using new and existing networks of local lanes, some of which are not fit for HGV's, between 7am-7pm Monday-Saturday?	Table 4.1 of C6.3.14.1 ES Appendix 14.1 Transport Assessment [APP-134] provides approximate lengths of the construction period for each Site. The Transport Assessment also provides anticipate numbers of traffic movements for each Site, summarised in Table 5.1.
EBA-06			The scheme will result in significant adverse landscape effects.	The Applicant points the Party to its landscape-related response to issue reference 'LAN-01' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
EBA-07			A development of this size, (combined) contradicts various environmental and food security papers and reports. Ignoring the recommendations from experts in their field.	Assessments of potential environmental impacts have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] . Relevant policy and evidence for each topic is set out in each of the ES Chapter.
EBA-08			Off shore wind turbine is a much more "proven" way of efficiently producing electricity for the UK. Evidence of solar farms impact on biodiversity remains limited and is only 11-15% efficient,	C7.11 Statement of Need [APP-350] sets out how large-scale solar has a role in the UK's renewable energy generation.
EBA-09			Food security must be a priority for the UK. The carbon footprint on importing 40 % of the countries food is notable and the majority of crops grown within these areas are essential to the bio diversity of the area and the reduction of CO2.	The Applicant does not consider that the Scheme would result in adverse food security impacts either alone or cumulatively. The UK annual balance of domestically produced food is sensitive to non-planning factors including weather and markets. The relevant assessment for policy purposes (and therefore decision-making purposes under the Planning Act 2008) is one that is based on the grade of the agricultural land, rather than its current use and the intensity

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				of that use. In terms of key threats to UK food security, the Defra UK Food Security Report highlights that the main threat is climate change.
EBA-10			Solar farms will not continue to provide the same amount of jobs these farming areas do currently. They will not create an economic benefit to the already hard-pressed communities affected.	The Applicant points the Party to its socio-economics-related response to issue reference 'STR-17' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .
EBA-11			Solar farms make it impossible for local authorities to commit to a viable local nature recovery strategy which aims to do the complete opposite to what would happen in the areas making unstable eco systems.	C6.2.9 ES Chapter 9_Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] and C6.2.8 ES Chapter 8_Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] assess how the Scheme complies with national and local policy and supports improvements to biodiversity.
EBA-12			Health and wellbeing of residents is a priority for our Local Authority, the landscape, noise, increase in traffic, bridal and footpath disruption will have an adverse effect not to mention the negative impact on birds, insects, bats and agricultural diversity.	The impacts of the scheme on ecology, landscape and human health have been assessed through the relevant chapters of the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] .
EBA-13			In 2021 there was 250,000 hectares of south facing commercial roof space = 50% of UKs electricity. 17 million homes in the UK only 6% have PV's and	The consideration of alternatives has been undertaken within C6.2.5 ES Chapter 5 Alternatives and Design

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			there are 7 million hectares of brownfield sites or grade 4 & 5 land all better for solar placement.	Evolution [APP-040] and its accompanying appendix C6.3.5.1 ES Appendix 5.1 Site Selection Assessment [APP-067] . Specifically, paragraphs 2.1.23 to 2.1.32 detail the consideration of brownfield land and roof tops and sets out why these were discounted as unsuitable. The methodology used for the site selection process is considered reasonable and proportionate and complies with the requirements of NPS EN-1 4.4.3.
EBA-14			Further research into electromagnetic sensitivity is required before large scale plans are agreed.	All objects carrying an electrical current will induce electric and magnetic fields. The electromagnetic fields generated by the Scheme are not anticipated to pose any significant risk to human health, nor detrimental impact to nearby infrastructure, as demonstrated by EMF impacts being scoped out of the Environmental Impact Assessment (see section 3.13 of C6.3.2.2 ES Appendix 2.2 EIA Scoping Opinion [APP-064]). In addition, the Applicant points the party to its electromagnetic field

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				response to issue reference '7A-42' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
EBA-15			This is a knee jerk reaction that has not been thought out properly in the absence of a National land use strategy.	C6.2.6 ES Chapter 6_Energy Need Legislative Context and Energy Policy [APP-041] and C7.11 Statement of Need [APP-350] set out how the Scheme contributes to meeting national policy and national objects on renewable energy generation.
EBA-16			Lincolnshire appears to be the governments answer to all problems at the moment, Migrants at Scampton, Large scale Solar energy, everywhere and potentially a mineral mine in Lea. In the future a fusion plant will also play apart in the areas development but residents are concerned of the impact on the rural areas we call homes. I would like to state that I am not apposed to solar energy but I am for this area using land that could otherwise produce food.	The Applicant notes this comment.

Stephen John Booth [AS-024]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
MSB2-01		[health]	<p>I am writing to express my extreme concern regarding the proposed routing of the main power cable for the Cottam Solar project at West Farm, Normanby by Stow DN21 5LQ (What3words succumbs.calms.alarm) If the proposed project goes ahead (which I object to) then the cable route, with its high electromagnetic fields and associated health risks to those living nearby, will pass very close to a number of properties including my family residence.</p> <p>I would urge that a site visit is conducted prior to any permissions being given and that an alternative route approximately 150 metres South, crossing the grass field at West Farm before crossing Stow Road B1241 (What3Words rarely.mega.sampled) be considered. This would be an easier route to use, crossing fields instead of tarmac roadways, private driveways and gardens and this would take the cable route well away from the current and proposed houses at West Farm and West Farm Cottages.</p> <p>My concerns are that if this ill-conceived project is to proceed, the current route will lead to massive and unnecessary disruption to the local residents during the construction phase, as the driveways where vehicles are parked will be cut off. The health risks to residents are being ignored by the cable being sited near to housing. The current route crosses the property of two land owners but consulting with a third landowner could facilitate this alternative route. The third landowner has already been approached by one of the other local solar projects with a view to cable routing. Why has the Cottam Solar project not consulted with this landowner?</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the Party's suggested location for a site visit.</p> <p>The Applicant points the party to its electromagnetic field response to issue reference '7A-42' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>With respect to the Party's construction phase concerns, the Applicant points the party to its transport-related response to issue reference 'TRA-02' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Michael Dover [AS-025]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
MD2-01			1) I object because this proposal is just one of four huge proposals total size of the development (s) 10,000 acres, would be equal to the metropolitan area of the city of Lincoln. The our developments are close to each other, impacting over 30 villages in West Lindsey. The developers are working together and sharing resources and cable routes and I believe the same legal team. Therefore these developments, the impact and unsuitability, should be considered as a whole entity and not as four single developments.	Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] . Cumulative effects assessments for each topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with the NSIPs identified in paragraph 2.5.9 of C6.2.2 ES Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037] . This assessment is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.
MD2-02			2. I object to the project because I feel the developers have failed to consult in good faith with communities or individuals. Questions have remained unanswered, promises of information have been withheld and the project has been kept deliberately vague by over use of the "Rochdale Envelope"	C5.1 Consultation Report [APP-021] sets out how the Applicant consulted on the Scheme and has addressed responses to the consultations. The reasons for using the "Rochdale Envelope" approach are provided in C6.2.4_A ES Chapter 4_Scheme Description Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C6.2.4_A] .

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
MD2-03			3. I object to the project because of the cumulative loss of best most versatile (BMV) arable land and the loss of crops for many decades. In particular at a time when the world is experiencing diminished availability of wheat and grain ,due to the ongoing conflict in Ukraine, coupled with a global fall in the rice harvest yield.	As set out in Table 19.10 of C6.2.7_A ES Chapter 7 Climate Change Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C6.2.7_A] , 94.8% of the agricultural land resource within the Sites is ALC Grade 3b, which not classed as best and most versatile land.
MD2-04			4.The agricultural industry locally and nationally will be impacted by these huge sites, tenant farmers stand to lose their homes and livelihoods, there probably will be a reduction in agricultural employment well into the future, in the agricultural service sector too, agricultural engineering, seed and fertiliser suppliers. Loss of crop GDP and consequently higher food imports. Whilst work opportunities on a solar park beyond initial construction will be minimal.	The Applicant points the Party to its socio-economics-related response to issue reference 'STR-17' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .
MD2-05			5. I object to the source of PV Solar panels, batteries, and associated equipment. Manufactured in China, under alleged forced labour, and utilising the exponentially increasing use of power generated from Coal Fired plants. I have further reservations as China becomes more belligerent and threatening to the West ,that the UK should not become reliant on China for it's Energy Security.	The Applicant points the Party to its climate change response to issue reference 'CC-08' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .
MD2-06	The Scheme	Wildlife Impacts	6. I object because of the loss of habitats of so many species of wildlife that live and seasonally visit. The enclosure of sites and sub sites will prevent ranging species such as Fox & Deer from passage, forcing them to enclosure perimeters and roads increasing risk of animal/vehicular collisions, bird population such as Lapwing / skylarks and a myriad of species will be in danger of decline as hedgerows, trees and field habitats are replaced,	The Applicant points the Party to its ecology and biodiversity response to issue response reference 'TDF-03' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
MD2-07			7. I object to the project due to the impact of increased traffic over a 3-4 year construction period, (a period that would potentially be repeated every 10-15 years as panel life requires replacement) would exponentially multiply over rural roads that are unsuitable for the increased volume of HGV, light goods, plant, abnormal loads & daily workforce traffic. The detritus carried from field to road would cause danger to other road users, horse riders, cyclists etc. in addition to causing damage to an already sub standard road surface verges paving and kerbs	An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been prepared to support the application within C6.3.14.2_A ES Appendix 14.2 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/EX1/C6.3.14.2_A]. This will be secured through Requirement 15 in C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B]. The outline CTMP provides a framework for the management of construction vehicle movements to and from the Scheme, to ensure that the effects of the temporary construction phase on the local highway network are minimised and made acceptable.
MD2-08			8. I object to the project because I believe that the developers have deliberately misled by project output claims and therefore carbon offset claims too. Questions about details of percentage output posed at the consultation meetings remained unanswered despite follow up promises.	The Applicant acknowledges the comments made by the Party but respectfully disagrees.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
MD2-09			9. I strongly object to The Cottam project because of the probable increase in surface water flood risk. Properties adjacent to the project May will be at greater risk of property flooding. Plans to cover this area with Solar PV panels would potentially increase the flood risk due to the increased runoff & concentration pooling onto a clay substrate with a slow permeable rate from panels during periods of heavy rain.	The Applicant confirms that surface and foul water drainage details are secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 to C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B] where it states that " <i>No part of the authorised development may commence until written details of the surface water drainage scheme and (if any) foul water drainage system for that part have been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority.</i> "
MD2-10			10. I object to this project due to the potential impact on local tourism. Many small lodge and fishing holiday parks have opened in the last few years and these would lose visitor appeal once surrounded by mega solar sites. The cumulative effect of 4 huge solar industrial sites would cover most of the Trent valley running toward Lincoln, the views from Burton cliff, Lincoln's spectacular Cathedral along with the Castle and uphill Lincoln all favourite tourism attractions would be impacted by the loss of rural vista.	The Applicant points the Party to its socio-economic response to issue reference 'MGBPC-08' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .
MD2-11			11. I object to this project on the grounds of safety. I have concerns that the lithium batteries (BSS) have an inherent dangerous tendency to explode and burn. Fighting these fires is difficult and I believe the local fire stations do not have the requisite equipment to contain and extinguish these fires. In addition the toxic fumes from these fires has potential to cause harm to	The Applicant notes this comment and considers that the provisions of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B] are adequate

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			humans and livestock. Chemical and mineral contamination would inevitably be leached into the hitherto fertile land and or watercourses, causing environmental and health problems.	to secure the safe operation of the battery storage system. C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B], provides, in Requirement 6(2) that the relevant planning authority must consult with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue and the Environment Agency before approving the battery storage safety management plan.
MD2-12		Mental health	12. I object to the project because of the adverse impact on communities, the impact already being seen with reduced property values and cancelled sales due to the spectre of solar development. There is undoubtedly an impact on peoples mental health. Village interaction is in jeopardy of being curtailed as villages are encircled by acres of Solar PV and the thread of rural community is severed.	The Applicant notes this comment and points the Party to its socio-economics-related response to issue reference 'FPM-05' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
MD2-13			13. I object to the project on grounds of noise caused by pilling, workforce, construction, plant movement & operation and traffic movement. 12 hours a day 6 days per week for 3-4 years. Then noise of site operation, cooling fans switch gear etc. promised information following sound sampling, we're withheld by the developers.	An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been prepared to support the application within C6.3.14.2_A ES Appendix 14.2 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/EX1/C6.3.14.2_A]. This will

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>be secured through Requirement 15 in C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B].</p> <p>Requirement 16 in C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B] states that details of the operational mitigation measures set out in C6.2.15 ES Chapter 15_Noise and Vibration [APP-050] must be approved by the relevant planning authority.</p>
MD2-14			<p>14.The proposed area of the site is predominantly rural, the inclusion of security fencing will not only impact wildlife but with intrusive perimeter lighting and CCTV cameras it will alter the area from rural to industrial landscape. Additionally there are concerns about privacy, not only personal for those living along side or near each enclosed site, but also those transiting the area. Who has access and what is footage used for? What are the guaranteed data protection safeguards? No answers have been received despite attending consultation. The other major concern is the origins of these cameras, world wide Chinese made cameras are being removed from sensitive sites due to possible security issues, no information has been given.</p>	<p>In paragraph 4.5.59 of C6.2.4_A ES Chapter 4_Scheme Description Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C6.2.4_A] it is stated that CCTV around the perimeter of the Scheme will be internally facing.</p>

Gwen Eastwood [AS-026]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
GE-01	The Scheme Ecology	Alternatives Ecological Impact	The total project is too big. Nothing against solar panels but the scale of this will impact on wildlife in the area. Why are solar panels not compulsory on the roofs of all new build projects. This would then lesson the scale.	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its ecology and biodiversity response to issue response reference 'TDF-03' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The consideration of alternatives has been undertaken within C6.2.5 ES Chapter 5 Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-040] and its accompanying appendix C6.3.5.1 ES Appendix 5.1 Site Selection Assessment [APP-067]. Specifically, paragraphs 2.1.23 to 2.1.32 detail the consideration of brownfield land and roof tops and sets out why these were discounted as unsuitable. The methodology used for the site selection process is considered reasonable and proportionate and complies with the requirements of NPS EN-1 4.4.3.</p>

John Eastwood [AS-027]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
JE-01	The Scheme Ecology	Alternatives Ecological Impact	This project is too big. Why are new buildings not built with compulsory solar roof a Panels and brick solar options. The sale will impact on wildlife for years to come. With so many other options available, this is lazy planning	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its ecology and biodiversity response to issue response reference 'TDF-03' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The consideration of alternatives has been undertaken within C6.2.5 ES Chapter 5 Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-040] and its accompanying appendix C6.3.5.1 ES Appendix 5.1 Site Selection Assessment [APP-067]. Specifically, paragraphs 2.1.23 to 2.1.32 detail the consideration of brownfield land and roof tops and sets out why these were discounted as unsuitable. The methodology used for the site selection process is considered reasonable and proportionate and complies with the requirements of NPS EN-1 4.4.3.</p>

Nicholas Mapstone [AS-028]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
NM-01			<p>Renewable energy is useful in principle but it is important to consider how and where it is implemented. I do not believe that it is a good use of our limited resources of viable, productive farmland to be taken out of production to be replaced with an extensive solar panel array.</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>This is one of 4 schemes in a small area of rural Lincolnshire which, if built will become the largest solar farm in Europe – all where communities and people live. Local residents are faced with the prospect of a cumulative total of 10,000 acres of solar, industrialised development in this area of West Lindsey where productive farmland, currently used for food and the foodchain, will be removed from production at a time when we need it most. This is completely counter-intuitive given the cost of living crisis, the costs of importing food from abroad and the uncertain future the world faces at the moment. These are not only financial costs but green costs. Why import food from abroad with the consequent carbon footprint, when we can produce food at home? Contrary to the beliefs of the developers, as evidenced in the consultation meeting, the local agriculture is thriving, producing wheat, barley, rape seed and animal feed.</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>If the scheme is implemented, it will have a huge impact upon the local area and the people who live here. The National Planning Policy Framework continues to question approving solar panel projects on agricultural land graded 1, 2 and 3a. My local MP has urged ministers to extend this presumption to land graded 3b as it is virtually the same quality when growing wheat and grain</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider that the Scheme would result in adverse food security impacts either alone or cumulatively. The UK annual balance of domestically produced food is sensitive to non-planning factors including weather and markets. The relevant assessment for policy purposes (and therefore decision-making purposes under the Planning Act 2008) is one that is based on the grade of the agricultural land, rather than its current use and the intensity of that use. In terms of key threats to UK food security, the Defra UK Food Security Report highlights that the main threat is climate change.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			[...] 3. Farmland (including 3b, used for barley and wheat, as in the local area) should not be used for industrial purposes.	
NM-02			Whilst solar energy has its place, the pursuit of Net Zero is unlikely to be achieved by 2050 targets. I therefore think the Schemes are presumptuous and rushed in conjunction with the other schemes that have been proposed in this small area all on the back of the Cottam Power Plant situation. It is opportunism at the expense of a carefully thought-out proposal that could have been better considered to leave agricultural land alone and one that could benefit local communities affected. I see no awareness of the needs or well-being of the local community in your proposals.	C6.2.6 ES Chapter 6_Energy Need Legislative Context and Energy Policy [APP-041] and C7.11 Statement of Need [APP-350] set out how the Scheme contributes to meeting national policy and national objects on renewable energy generation.
NM-03			This acreage is totally disproportional and represents an unprecedented industrialisation of this part of Lincolnshire and a huge loss of rural land, the size of the City of Lincoln, decimating communities, farmland, local livelihoods and agriculture. Not only will farmland be lost to industrialisation but jobs and skills within agriculture will be seriously undermined. Solar panels simply should not be placed on useful farmland – wrong plan, wrong place.	The Applicant points the Party to its socio-economics-related response to issue reference 'STR-17' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .
NM-04			These acres of solar panels would dominate the landscape for miles around because of its topography; a landscape designated as an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The Tillbridge Scheme is proposed to be sited in a large valley, highly visible from the Lincoln Cliff Road (B1398). The views, quality of life and mental health well-being will be severely impacted. [...]	Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] . Cumulative effects assessments for each topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>The clear sensitivities relate to the visual impact of a possible large-scale solar array from the local area because of the topography. Many people will be travelling along Middle Road (Lincoln Cliff Road) and see the solar array from miles around. The visual impact will be massive and certainly difficult to ignore. In my opinion, no amount of hedging will obscure this. The solar farms would have potentially catastrophic effects on the landscape for decades to come, as discussed earlier. A bit of hedging will not mitigate these impacts.</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>The clear sensitivities relate to the visual impact of a possible large-scale solar array from the local area because of the topography. Many people will be travelling along Middle Road (Lincoln Cliff Road) and see the solar array from miles around. The visual impact will be massive and certainly difficult to ignore. In my opinion, no amount of hedging will obscure this.</p> <p>The solar farms would have potentially catastrophic effects on the landscape for decades to come, as discussed earlier. A bit of hedging will not mitigate these impacts.</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>We moved here [...]. Now, the beautiful, productive farmland surrounding us on all sides could become an industrialised monitored and fenced-in wasteland. Our area will become a place you drive through but will not want to visit. The walkers, ramblers and riders - all part of normal rural life here - will rightly shun this area. It is unimaginable what the difference to our area this scheme would make if allowed to go ahead. Rural areas and other economies need farmland. If we lose farmland, we risk untold damage to local communities and to the stewardship of our countryside.</p>	<p>with the NSIPs identified in paragraph 2.5.9 of C6.2.2 ES Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037]. This assessment is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>How much harm will be done to wildlife and the character of Public Rights of Way?</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>Solar farms are inefficient and whilst solar plays its part in producing energy, farmland should not be sacrificed for these inefficient structures.. What is wrong with solar farms?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clustering of development around sub-stations has disastrous consequences for the landscape and local amenity. The cumulative effect intensifies the harm caused. 2. Solar panels dramatically alter views of the countryside and its key features 	
NM-05	The Scheme	Alternatives	<p>Instead, they would be better placed on brownfield sites, on large, flat buildings and industrial structures. There is no evidence that I can find that the West Lindsay schemes have explored these options.</p> <p>[..]</p> <p>I see no evidence that this area has been selected on the grounds of suitability or merit but purely on availability and convenience, regardless of the human and ecological costs. Were brownfield or industrial sites considered? We haven't been told.</p>	<p>The consideration of alternatives has been undertaken within C6.2.5 ES Chapter 5 Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-040] and its accompanying appendix C6.3.5.1 ES Appendix 5.1 Site Selection Assessment [APP-067]. Specifically, paragraphs 2.1.23 to 2.1.32 detail the consideration of brownfield land and roof tops and sets out why these were discounted as unsuitable. The methodology used for the site selection process is considered reasonable and proportionate and</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				complies with the requirements of NPS EN-1 4.4.3.
NM-06			Were panel heights, glare, battery storage, generation capabilities and possible flood risks fully communicated to local residents? No. Even now, the full details of all the schemes are unclear and undefined.	<p>The maximum heights of the solar modules and other technical specifications are set out in C7.15_A Concept Design Parameters and Principles document [EN010133/EX1/C7.15_A] which is secured by Requirement 5 in Schedule 2 of C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B].</p> <p>The flood risks associated with the Scheme are assessed in 6.2.10 ES Chapter 10_Hydrology Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045].</p>
NM-07			The role of solar power is, unfortunately, limited because it provides power only intermittently and gives least power when it is needed most (winter evenings).	C7.11 Statement of Need [APP-350] set out the place of solar power within the national energy generation mix.
NM-08			The solar panels and complex infrastructure are likely to be manufactured abroad (China?) and the workforce imported from outside the local area. The manufacturing process involves unacceptable human costs – This is not ethical – it is human suffering and it is not green because of the need for recycling equipment composed of dangerous elements and a massive carbon footprint. This is all part of the \$1.5 trillion global climate change industry (source: Climate Change Business Journal). We can't undo what's	The Applicant points the Party to its supply chain response to issue reference 'CC-08' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			done but we can ensure that acres of solar panel don't eat up our precious farmland. This is no solution at all	
NM-09			There is a human cost which does not seem to have been considered. The local economy will suffer, amenities will be lost, people will lose jobs. There would be severe disruption during building and maintenance of this scheme, road havoc, noise disruption, harm to local wildlife, consequences of importing a significant non-local workforce into a rural village community. This is not to mention traffic, air and noise pollution. All this will affect our local community for many years to come and no support nor consideration has been given to these issues from these schemes.	Assessments of potential environmental impacts within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] include socio-economic impacts.
NM-10			<p>My property is within 400 metres of the proposed solar array area and a sub-station. I am concerned about health risks, safety risks, visual impact reduction and my house losing 1.5% of its value according to current data.</p> <p>I shall comment on these personal issues in the next section.</p> <p>I have comments on all these areas since my house is perched on the boundary of the proposed scheme and the proposed area of solar panelling starts within 400 metres of my property. The blog-site, Climate Café suggest that nobody should be, let alone live, within 500 metres of a large-scale solar farm because likely emissions and radiation could potentially be a hazard. Additionally, living in a flat terrain (characteristic of Lincolnshire) may pose a greater risk than living in a hilly one. Some of the potential health hazards are exposure to light from the panels which can damage the eye, electromagnetic fields, noise and air pollution, fire risk, and electromagnetic interference. In the USA, if you intend to build a new home near a solar farm, it must be at least 3 km away – bear in mind, our property is 400 metres away.</p>	Assessments of potential environmental impacts within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] Include impacts on human health, including the chapters on Noise, Glint and Glare.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>As a result, I am concerned that no precise information was forthcoming from Tillbridge Solar representatives at the consultation meeting in Glentworth. I raised concerns over the precise boundary between my property and the solar farm, possible noise from the sub-station (as the crow flies, less than 500 metres from my house). On your map, my land abuts an area designated for potential woodland but no details about the precise nature of this and who will decide were forthcoming. This is of great concern when it's next door to your house. My requests for information about noise factors also met with no detailed response nor data, even though I'd left my email so that I could have been given this information subsequently. Both I and another resident raised concerns over access to the site which were also not addressed convincingly. This is all apart from the issue of health and safety and the possible consequences for local wildlife which are of great concern to me. My wife and I are , living in an isolated property with our on the edge of what could become an industrial complex with on-site staff, cameras security etc. We moved to pour house to give our , in open fields, surrounded by wildlife. She is and there is evidence that large-scale solar farms can adversely affect</p>	
NM-11			<p>Our which could now be taken away from us. We relish the glorious wealth of wildlife – hares, deer, rabbits, migrating and groundnesting birds which could be severely impacted by solar industrialisation. It is a heart-breaking prospect for a family who has chosen to build their home here for 23 years. Where are the considerations in Tillbridge's proposals for human cost?</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its ecology and biodiversity response to issue response reference 'TDF-03' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
NM-12			<p>Compared to my concerns over the potential solar complex so close to my home, the cable route corridor is of far less consequence but yet another desecration of this area and disruption to those who live in it.</p> <p>I consider that the scheme is flawed and should not be granted operational consent. The plans are based on modelling which we have recently had cause to question in other areas of planning. I believe that the local impact of this scheme in terms of traffic disruption, noise and social disruption in all phases of the development have been underestimated. I have no confidence that the representatives of Tillbridge Solar have the local knowledge nor interest to mitigate local worries if given consent for development.</p> <p>Access to the area is via two roads: Middle Road and the A631. Both are narrow, potentially hazardous roads with potential disruption to a site access causing delays and diversions. This is a rural area with a concomitant road infrastructure. Once again, the consultation meeting gave me no confidence that Tillbridge Solar would address these issues properly.</p>	<p>C6.3.14.1 ES Appendix 14.1 Transport Assessment [APP-134] sets out how construction traffic will be managed to minimise impacts.</p> <p>C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B], provides (in Requirement 15 of Schedule 2) that, before development commences, a construction traffic management plan must be approved by the local planning authority. The plan "<i>must be substantially in accordance with the outline construction traffic management plan</i>".</p>
NM-13			<p>There are no apparent community benefit plans only community disadvantages.</p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund – see paragraph 4.8.1 of C7.5_A Planning Statement [EN010133/EX1/C7.5_A]. This fund will be available for community-based benefits throughout the lifetime of the Scheme. The provision of the Community Benefit Fund itself does not form a part of the DCO Application, and therefore will be</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				agreed separately between the Applicant and the fund's beneficiaries.
NM-14	[process]		I should like to comment on the paucity and flawed nature of the whole consultation process. The main representative of Tillbridge Solar began the meeting I went to by stating that the proposals were designated as a "nationally important infrastructure". However, the problem with this is that decisions will be made in Whitehall, not locally. I believe that such applications should be subject to local approval, not Westminster. Thus, the process is flawed, at heart. Ultimately, the final decision will be made by the Secretary of State for Climate Change and Net Zero – clearly not an independent adjudicator.	The Applicant notes this comment and notes that this Examination is in respect of the Cottam Solar Project DCO.
NM-15		[consultation]	<p>The 'experts' present at the local consultation meetings were employed by the developers. How impartial is their advice to the organisation paying for their services? Furthermore, at the end of your consultation form (What happens next section), respondents are told that "we will set out a summary of the responses that you have given in a Consultation Report". A summary selected by the proposing organisation seems, therefore, to be the only record of peoples' concerns. Despite this, I can only hope for an impartial review to be passed on to Planning Inspectorate for consideration. I shall be studying this with interest.</p> <p>Additionally, the local consultation meetings have not been at all helpful. For example, the representatives of Tillbridge Solar simply repeated what had been said at the local Parish Council meeting in Glentworth a few weeks previously and were no more informative at the meetings with 'experts'. The latter also failed to answer detailed questions and anxieties.. This made me feel more concerned and failed to allay any of my worries</p>	C5.1 Consultation Report [APP-021] sets out how the Applicant consulted on the Scheme and has addressed responses to the consultations on the Cottam Solar Project.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>about the proposals. There appeared to be no empathy for the worries of local residents nor any attempt to respond to their concerns. I felt there was a clear failure of any of the representatives to speak from a position of knowledge rather than sound-bites and conjecture.</p> <p>My over-riding impression is of a rushed and ill-thought out scheme that is going through the motions of consultation rather than actually consulting. The definition of consultation is not simply a period of time.</p>	
NM-16	The Scheme	Land Use and Decommissioning	4. Solar farms are NOT environmentally friendly: they pollute the environment, the panels are not fully recyclable, will add to land-fill and have a huge carbon footprint.	The panels are predominantly made from recyclable materials. The Applicant refers the parties to Table 20.7 in C6.2.20 ES Chapter 20 Waste [APP-055] which identifies estimated volumes of waste from decommissioning. Approximately 95% of the panel weight is made from glass and metal frames, which can easily be reused and recycled. The remaining silicon and electrical waste can be partially recycled at Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) facilities.
NM-17	The Scheme	CCTV	5. The amenity of neighbouring property can be seriously harmed by secured boundaries and intrusive CCTV	In paragraph 4.5.59 of C6.2.4_A ES Chapter 4_Scheme Description Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C6.2.4_A] it is stated that CCTV around the perimeter of the Scheme will be internally facing.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
NM-18	Soils	Soil quality	6.The land will not be returned to agriculture for at least 40 years by which time, it will have deteriorated to the point of probable no return. What will be the future then for this area? Reinstatement bonds are worthless	C6.2.19_A ES Chapter 19 Soils and Agriculture Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C6.2.19_A] states that 'the enforced fallow period' during operation will facilitate 'a recovery in topsoil organic matter' and 'enhance the functional capacity of the soil resource for future arable production' (paragraph 19.9.14).
NM-19			I do not believe that any of these schemes come near to addressing, let alone to providing answers to the above issues. The scheme's documentation is vague, lacks depth and detail and fails to answers the valid concerns of local residents.	The Applicant notes this comment.
NM-20			There are better alternatives that could produce more renewable energy without removing farmland from production and ruining this community. For example, in comparison to off-shore wind, solar panels are hugely inefficient. A 400 acre solar park is said to be capable of supplying energy to 9,000 homes. One North Sea wind turbine gas the capacity to power 16,000 homes. In terms of the amount of power exported to the grid, solar's rating is 11 - 15% whereas off-shore wind achieves a figure of 50%+ - and it doesn't destroy the countryside and communities.	C7.11 Statement of Need [APP-350] sets out how large-scale solar has a role in the UK's renewable energy generation.
NM-21			In my view, these are opportunist schemes; just another part of the \$1.6 trillion global climate change industry which has not paid due diligence to the need for this country to keep farmland for essential food production, the needs and wishes of the community in this area of Lincolnshire nor the well-being/mental health consequences of local residents.	The Applicant notes this comment.

Stuart Menzies [AS-029]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SM-01	The Scheme	Residential Amenity Loss of Agricultural Land Impact on Wildlife	These solar farms should not be built next to or in view of residential houses, on prime farm land, in areas that will cause soil erosion or have an adverse effect on wildlife, streams or anywhere else that would interfere with the natural scenic beauty of our countryside.	<p>C6.2.8 ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] (the 'LVIA') looks to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the landscape character of the Study Area and to reduce the visibility of the Scheme from residential properties and other public vantage points including transport routes, public footpaths, permissive footpaths and green lane network. This mitigation is aimed to benefit the community as a whole to enhance their way of life as well as green infrastructure (see paras. 8.1.1 and 8.8.3).</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its ecology and biodiversity response to issue response reference '7A-16' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>
SM-02	Cumulative Development	Cumulative Effects	There will be a four year construction schedule for the Cottam Solar Project and three other similar projects planned for the West Lindsey District of Lincolnshire, meaning four Nationally Significant Infrastructure	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
		Well-being	Projects (NSIPs) within a few miles of each other all being examined independently. These projects combined will transform the area into a 10,000 acre building site and ultimately this would be the largest solar complex in Europe. This is just not acceptable to the local community due to the impact all the construction work will have on the well being and mental health of residents of the whole area, and all four of these solar projects should be assessed together due to the massive impact they will have on the local infrastructure.	Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] . The Applicant is cognisant of the significance of the countryside for physical and mental wellbeing and, as such, likely impacts on the desirability and use of recreational facilities in the countryside, such as public rights of way, have been assessed in Section 18.7 of C6.2.18 ES Chapter 18 Socio Economics Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] . The greatest level of effect to access, desirability and use of recreational facilities is moderate-minor adverse and is anticipated during construction (see para. 18.7.60-67) and decommissioning (see para. 18.7.143-153). These effects are not anticipated to be significant.
SM-03	Cable Route	Wildlife Impacts Landscape Impacts	On top of all the disturbance to the natural habitat of the wildlife and plants in installing the panels in the fields, there will be a massive disruption, disturbance and unnecessary damage to more farmland and plant/animal habitat by many miles of cable trenching across the countryside, to install the underground cables to the grid connection points at the existing Cottam National Grid substation. This development	The Applicant points the Party to its landscape and biodiversity impact response to issue response reference 'KPCL-19' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			will have an adverse impact on the character of local countryside as well as major, irretrievable loss of wildlife, from the initial 2 years of disruption caused by heavy construction traffic and then throughout its operational life.	Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
SM-04	Cable Route	Location	The proposed cable routes Island Green Power (IGP) have indicated are totally nonsensical and all routes for all Cottam solar projects are several miles distant from the existing Cottam grid substation connection point. Running cables from from Pelham/ Blyton/Corringham to Cottam will involve accessing ten different land parcels and will mean massive unneeded civil works for laying the cable route. The choice of cable route is almost laughable and clearly hasn't been given much thought from many perspectives, e.g. planning, engineering, geographical, ecological disruption and impact on the environment and wildlife.	The Applicant points the Party to its cable route choice response to issue response reference 'KPCL-10' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
SM-05	The Scheme	Landscape Impact	<p>These four solar projects will dominate and not blend into the local landscape, plus the thousands of acres of solar panels will be highly visible and very difficult to hide on the rolling countryside and next to main roads, particularly the B1398 'Lincoln Cliff Road,' which is an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). We made the choice to live in or be surrounded by the countryside, if these proposals go ahead the issues would be enormous for many people. Their lives being impacted by 4 years of construction on a 10,000 acre building site, a total landscape change and the oppression of 15 feet high solar panels looming over everywhere you look.</p> <p>These solar farms/panels will have a massive impact on rural homes due to land grabs for the installation of 15 feet high mechanised solar panels, vast battery storage containers and associated equipment, including CCTV being sited close to homes. These projects will change peoples rural</p>	The Applicant points the Party to its landscape impact response to issue response reference 'KPC-05' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			lifestyle to one with an industrial outlook and a number of features associated with these solar farms were inadequately communicated in the early stages of IGP's engagement with the local communities. Consequently one begins to wonder what other information about the schemes has not been relayed accurately.	
SM-06	Agriculture and Soils	Use of Farmland	The Cottam Solar Project will cover over 3,000 acres of farmland and because 3 other solar projects are proposed for the West Lindsey area up to 10000 acres of farmland could be lost to solar arrays, batteries and electrical transformers within 7 miles of each other. These projects will make West Lindsey the most solar farm dense region in Europe and therefore the magnitude of these projects will cause total landscape domination in many local areas.	The Applicant points the Party to its loss of agriculture land response to issue response reference 'UPC-02' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .
SM-07	Agriculture and Soils	Use of Farmland	<p>This solar project, if approved, covers a large area of food producing farmland and will industrialise this land, and in fact the whole area, and has the potential to impact on employment and skill levels in the agricultural industry. Also, losing large areas of farmland will lead to a loss in food production capability, quite important right now bearing in mind the war in Ukraine and current food shortages in the UK. In fact this solar project will generate half the output of the current largest solar farm in Europe and thus will be a hugely inefficient use of productive farmland in the area.</p> <p>The loss of up to 10000 acres of farmland at a time when food security is a real issue both nationally and globally. The land should be left as food producing farmland and not decimated by these obscene monstrous solar panels. This precious commodity should not be used for these land hungry, inefficient solar projects that will provide little net gain in the UK's energy capacity.</p>	The Applicant points the Party to its loss of agriculture land response to issue response reference 'UPC-02' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SM-08	Alternative Sites	Site Selection	To install these solar farms on land capable of producing cereals around Gainsborough in Lincolnshire will be a totally inefficient use of food producing farmland and the projects should NOT be allowed to proceed on this basis. If the government is determined, in its quest for zero carbon, that solar farms are needed to be a major part of the energy mix, then solar panels should be compulsorily installed on the roofs of all new build factories and houses, and in time on all those similar buildings currently existing. Clearly installing solar panels on all buildings has the potential to reduce the energy costs for the owners and/or occupiers. According to the BRE National Solar Centre, in 2016 there was an estimated 250,000 hectares (617,764 Acres) of south facing commercial roof space in the UK. If utilised this could provide approximately half of the UK's electricity demand, therefore surely it is 'no brainer' to install solar panels on all commercial buildings instead of decimating food producing rural farmland.	The Applicant points the Party to its site selection response to issue response reference '7A-27' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
SM-09	The Scheme	Generation Capacity	Island Green Power state the Cottam solar project has the potential to generate around 600MW, in reality that level of output will not be achieved for the vast majority of time due to the solar panel capacity factor. Therefore their statement that the Cottam solar farms will replace 30% of the former generation of the coal fired Cottam Power Station is inaccurate and incorrect. As of June 2021, UK installed solar capacity was over 13.5GW, with the 72MW Shotwick Solar Farm being the largest in the country. Annual generation was slightly under 13TWh in 2020 (4.1% of UK electricity consumption). Peak generation was less than 10GW. Solar PV panels have a capacity factor of around 10% in the UK climate. The Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) assumes an average capacity factor of 9.7% for solar photovoltaics in the UK. Basically solar	The Applicant points the Party to its generation capacity response to issue response references 'ENG-03 and ENG-04' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>farms are an inefficient use of land when the contribution to the energy mix they make is considered.</p> <p>When one considers the electricity needs of this country to meet the future demand, planning and constructing solar farms with a capacity factor of less than 10% makes me wonder what the point is, especially with a solar panel efficiency of around 30% meaning vast acres of farm land are needed to install anything meaningful. The Grid system will struggle without the CCGTs for the foreseeable future with solar farms providing a minuscule contribution only when the sun is shining and/or light levels are high. The solar farms will be of absolutely no help in meeting demand during a tea time system peak in the middle of winter, i.e. when it is dark and very cold. Also, the solar farms capability to provide system frequency response or voltage regulation/MVAR provision, major requirements from a generator to ensure system stability, are both minimal</p>	
SM-10	The Scheme	Supply Chain	<p>I understand more than 60% of the world's solar panels are made in China. Therefore, I expect much of the other equipment Island Green Power are likely to install at the Cottam Solar Farm, if it's approved, e.g. switchgear, transformers, inverters, protection equipment, batteries etc., will most likely come from China or the Far East too. In 2021 China started building started building 33 gigawatts of coal-based power generation, according to the Helsinki based Centre for Research on Energy and clean Air (CREA). That is the mot new coal-fired power capacity China has undertaken since 2016 and says CREA, three times more than the rest of the world combined. So, by installing solar panels and other equipment manufactured in China it seems Island Green Power is moving part of the UK's carbon footprint to China and possibly elsewhere in the Far East. Also, transportation of all these goods from the Far East will cause a</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its supply chain response to issue response references '7A-51' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The Applicant notes this comment and refers the Party to paragraph 7.5.4 of C6.2.7_A ES Chapter 7 Climate Change Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C6.2.7_A] where it is</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>further increase in the global carbon footprint created by these solar projects.</p> <p>Nobody or company in this country with decent moral or ethical principles should be procuring anything from China right now, because to do so will support the Chinese global economic status and their capability to spy etc on the west and possibly invade Taiwan. Also, China's human rights record is appalling and that is another reason companies in the UK should not be trading with them, but I believe it's all about the money and the greed of the organisations involved.</p>	<p>anticipated that the PV panels will be sourced from China or a country of similar distance from the UK. Therefore, the Applicant has noted and accounted for the sourcing of panels within its assessment and that the manufacture and transport of products will likely be the largest sources of GHG emissions from the Scheme.</p>
SM-11	Battery Storage	BESS Safety	<p>Island Green Power state a very large Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) for storing electricity on-site will be installed and I believe this will be near Willingham-By-Stow. These type of batteries are known, from problems elsewhere, to be a source of danger from chemical spillage and fire, therefore they should not be located near to any type of property or housing estates. If the project goes ahead it is essential, from a safety perspective, for these batteries to be located away from residential areas and close to the Grid connection point.</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its BESS safety response to issue response references 'KPC-11' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>
SM-12	Battery Storage	BESS Need	<p>The project plan is for the electricity stored in the BESS to be released into the national grid when it's needed most. It may also enable energy to be imported from the national grid so it can be stored until it is needed. However, in terms of being able to support/ improve Grid System stability at a time of critical need the battery capacity (50MW or so I believe) will be totally insignificant and thus will provide minimal help to the System, or the demands of the nation on a winter's night when there is a howling gale and it is minus10 DegreesC and system stability is under stress.</p>	<p>Paragraph 7.2.8 of C6.2.7_A ES Chapter 7 Climate Change Revision A [EN010133/EX1/C6.2.7_A] states that assumptions have been made for the storage capacity of the two battery site size options, as 1357MWh and 2773MWh, exporting at 600MW into the National Grid transmission network, therefore representing an approximate 2-hour</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>or 4-hour energy supply. The time of day that this is provided can be controlled so that the energy stored can be supplied during hours of peak demand.</p> <p>Section 11.5 in C7.11 Statement of Need [APP-350] explains how electricity storage (BESS) will play an important role in the development of a low-carbon GB energy system. Electricity storage may be connected as a standalone asset or collocated with a renewable generation scheme. Because the Scheme's grid connection agreement provides both import and export capacity, it enables the Scheme to contribute to meeting the national need for electricity storage by including, as associated development, an electricity storage asset which supports the operation of the principal solar development and provides the ability to balance the electricity produced by the solar scheme, with demand on the National Electricity Transmission System.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				Section 4, paragraphs 4.5.21 to 4.5.26 of C7.5_A Planning Statement [EN010133/EX1/C7.5_A] set out that the BESS proposed as part of the Scheme is designed to provide peak generation and grid balancing services to the electricity grid by allowing excess electricity generated either from the solar PV panels, or imported from the electricity grid, to be stored in and dispatched when required.
SM-13	Lack of Detail	Inadequate Information	<p>2. EXAMPLES OF INADEQUACIES WITHIN THE Cottam PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL INSPECTION REPORT (PEIR) - Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity.</p> <p>To demonstrate my concerns about these solar projects and the inadequacies of the Cottam PEIR I sent some sample comments/questions, based on the comments below to IGP and they have failed to respond to anything. Therefore, it would appear that many of the environmental aspects associated with the rural countryside and farmland, likely to be impacted upon by the construction and operation of the solar farms, were not thoroughly considered or communicated to the public during the consultation process. As far as I am concerned this means that Island Green Power did not fully and properly engage with local communities during that process.</p> <p>It is evident local ecology and diversity will be changed forever if these projects are allowed to proceed and for this reason they should be</p>	The Applicant acknowledges this comment but is confident that the information presented throughout the submission is in accordance with the relevant policies and legislation.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			prevented from proceeding. Despite IGP stating there are gains they describe little of what they will do to actually provide a single gain.	
SM-14	Lack of Detail	Biodiversity Net Gain	<p>Para 9.9 Biodiversity Net Gain and Ecological Enhancements</p> <p>COMMENT - The two paragraphs 9.9.1 and 9.9.2 are all I can see with reference to Biodiversity Gain and Ecological Enhancements and these give minimal detail during the consultation phase about what IGP are going to do for Biodiversity Net Gain and Ecological Enhancements. Para 9.6 Preliminary Assessment of Effects</p>	<p>The Applicant respectfully disagrees.</p> <p>C6.3.9.12 ES Appendix 9.12 Biodiversity Net Gain Report [APP-089] sets out how a significant net gain for biodiversity has been calculated as a result of the Scheme, which will be secured throughout the operation life of the Scheme (see paragraph 8.1.2 of [APP-089]). The BNG Report shows that an anticipated net gain of 96.09% for habitat units, an anticipated 70.22% for hedgerow units and an anticipated 10.69% for river units will stand to be achieved through the Scheme.</p>
SM-15	The Scheme	Landscape Effects	<p>Habitats</p> <p>Woodland</p> <p>Construction Phase Impacts - 9.6.33 STATES - "A protective development-free buffer of 20m from all woodland has been designed into the scheme..... "</p> <p>QUESTION - How do we know 20m is enough for obscuring the public's view of the monstrous solar panels?</p>	<p>Mitigation, including offsets and planting, has been proposed to address and minimise adverse effects on the character of the landscape, protect existing woodlands and promote wildlife conservation. This is in line with the agreed methodology and the</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>hierarchy of approach advocated by the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition.</p> <p>These mitigation offsets have been discussed and agreed with Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) and Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) at the series of workshops as set out in C6.3.8.4 ES Appendix 8.4 Consultation [APP-076].</p> <p>With regard to the offsets from neighbouring residential properties C6.2.8 ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] (the 'LVIA') considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme, including the proximity to people's houses to ensure the impacts and effects on the views and visibility are taken into account [paras. 8.4.28 to 8.4.32]. This includes singular buildings, groups of buildings and towns or villages. Table 8.15 of the LVIA sets out the</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				selection of initial residential receptors for the purpose of the assessment and the reason for their selection are those receptors within the 1km Study Area for the Scheme and the 0.5km Study Area from the outer boundary of the Cable Route Corridor [para. 8.4.12], including the BESS areas. The detailed analysis is set out at C6.3.8.3 ES Appendix 8.3 Assessment of Potential Visual Effects [APP-075] .
SM-16	Landscape	Woodland Impacts	<p>9.6.34 STATES - "Woodland in close proximity to construction works would remain sensitive to degradationIn the absence of mitigation, the severity of these impacts would range from minor to severe but would be expected to be short or medium term and reversible in the long term."</p> <p>COMMENT -I believe long term reversibility on the impact of woodland is not acceptable because in the interim plant and wildlife species will be lost forever</p>	<p>Mitigation, including offsets and planting, has been proposed to address and minimise adverse effects on the character of the landscape, protect existing woodlands and promote wildlife conservation. This is in line with the agreed methodology and the hierarchy of approach advocated by the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>These mitigation offsets have been discussed and agreed with Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) and Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) at the series of workshops as set out in C6.3.8.4 ES Appendix 8.4 Consultation [APP-076].</p> <p>With regard to the offsets from neighbouring residential properties C6.2.8 ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] (the 'LVIA') considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme, including the proximity to people's houses to ensure the impacts and effects on the views and visibility are taken into account [paras. 8.4.28 to 8.4.32]. This includes singular buildings, groups of buildings and towns or villages. Table 8.15 of the LVIA sets out the selection of initial residential receptors for the purpose of the assessment and the reason for their selection are those receptors within the 1km Study Area for the Scheme</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				and the 0.5km Study Area from the outer boundary of the Cable Route Corridor [para. 8.4.12], including the BESS areas. The detailed analysis is set out at C6.3.8.3 ES Appendix 8.3 Assessment of Potential Visual Effects [APP-075] .
SM-17	Landscape	Wildlife Impacts	<p>9.6.35 STATES - "Construction activities could lead to a small amount of noise and possibly light disturbance to the species within the woodland.....It should be noted that a certain amount of noise disturbance, dust deposition and run off would be anticipated as a result of routine agricultural activities, and as such impacts are likely to be similar to the current baseline conditions."</p> <p>COMMENT - Agricultural activity impacts of noise and light disturbance are in no way comparable to those which will be present with the solar farms large, cumbersome and environmentally unfriendly construction activities.</p>	The Applicant points the Party to its ecology response to issue response references 'FPM-12' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .
SM-18	Ecology and Biodiversity	Protection of Wildlife Construction Phase	<p>Hedgerows and Trees</p> <p>Construction Phase Impacts - 9.6.43 STATES - "A protective development-free buffer of between 5m and 12m from all hedgerows has been designed into the scheme, to be installed during the construction phase and observed for the life of the scheme thereafter."</p> <p>9.6.44 STATES - "All individual in-field trees will be retained within the Sites. Such trees act as island or stepping-stones for wildlife and these are to be buffered from development according to their ecological value (between 8m and 12m from extent of Root Protection Zone). In addition, they are to be 'reconnected' to field boundaries through the planting of corridors of</p>	The ecologically sensitive design of the Scheme (such as the wide buffering of all field boundaries and the use of existing hedgerow gaps for accesses) will minimise the potential disturbance effects on protected and notable species during construction. These measures have been further detailed within C7.19 Outline

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>hedgerow and trees, improving their contribution to Green Infrastructure as corridors of dispersal."</p> <p>QUESTION - How will wildlife scared off by the construction phase be encouraged to return and thrive?</p>	<p>Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy [APP-356].</p> <p>The C7.3 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [APP-339] sets out how the additional hedgerow, scrub and tree planting will bring about positive effects for wildlife. In particular, terrestrial and aquatic invertebrates, botanical diversity, small mammals and many species of bird all stand to benefit.</p> <p>In our experience of monitoring over 100 active solar arrays, we have found that species associated with boundary habitats can thrive within an operational solar array, given the sensitive management of the retained and created habitats as set out in the C7.3_A Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010133/EX1/C7.3_A].</p>
SM-19	Ecology and Biodiversity	Bat Protection	<p>Bats</p> <p>Construction Phase Impacts - 9.6.80 STATES - "No artificial construction lighting is considered likely to be required outside of the winter months.</p>	<p>Lighting will only be required within working hours during the winter months, which will be carried out Monday to Friday 07:00 – 18:00 and</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>During winter, artificial lighting may be required within the construction zone due to the short day lengths....., As bats are in hibernation during the winter months, and only active occasionally for short periods, they are unlikely to be significantly affected. Therefore, it is anticipated that fragmentation of habitat as a result of light pollution will not occur."</p> <p>QUESTION - Anticipation is no surety that the construction period winter lighting will not have a long term impact on the bat population, how can it be assured that fragmentation will not occur?</p>	<p>08:00 to 13:30 on Saturdays. This means that only a small proportion of the hours of darkness will potentially be lit within the construction area. It is understood that the construction phase would be progressive, working on one or a small number of fields after another, rather than across all fields at the same time, thereby lessening potential impacts.</p> <p>Ecological protection buffers will be implemented at the onset of construction to protect all field boundaries and reduce the potential for light spill onto the retained boundary features. These are depicted within C6.3.9.11 ES Appendix 9.11 Schedule of Protective Ecological Buffers [APP-088] and apply to every field boundary within the Order Limits.</p> <p>A schedule of monitoring for bat activity is set out within the C7.3 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [APP-339] which will assess any changes in bat</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				activity during the lifetime of the project.
SM-20	Ecology and Biodiversity	Bat Protection	<p>Operational Phase Impacts</p> <p>Ecological Enhancement</p> <p>9.6.86 STATES - "The planting of new hedgerows and the management of diverse field boundaries stands to benefit bat populations through an increased number of roosting opportunities and increases in foraging capacity respectively."</p> <p>QUESTION - What happens to the bats after hedgerows are disturbed and before new hedgerows are planted and are mature?</p>	<p>The adoption of development free buffers, as set out within C6.3.9.11 ES Appendix 9.11 Schedule of Protective Ecological Buffers [APP-088] and apply to every field boundary within the Order Limits, from the onset of construction (protective fencing) through the operational lifespan of the Scheme will reduce the potential for disturbance impacts upon any roosts present in trees, as well as the potential for accidental damage or pollution events. These buffers will ensure the retention of uncultivated field margins and woodland edges.</p> <p>The C7.19 Outline Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy [APP-356] sets out how bats will be protected during the construction phase.</p> <p>As the vast majority of existing hedgerows will be retained and protected during construction, the</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				planting of new hedgerows and trees are seen as an enhancement for foraging and roosting bats in the longer term.
SM-21	Ecology and Biodiversity	Wildlife Impacts Construction Phase	<p>Otter and Water Vole</p> <p>Construction Phase Impacts - 9.6.92 STATES - "Otters and water voles may be impacted through direct harm (to animals or their burrows) or disturbance during any construction activity affecting ditches, watercourses etc."</p> <p>9.6.93 STATES - "Barriers to movement in the form of severed or blocked/culverted watercourses and linear natural features may cause population fragmentation, etc."</p> <p>9.6.94 STATES - "Construction activities and, potentially, routine operation and maintenance may cause disturbance to otters and water voles within shelter and accidental harm to their habitat or burrows."</p> <p>Residual Effects</p> <p>9.6.101 STATES - "residual effects upon otters and water voles are considered to be neutral and not significant."</p> <p>QUESTION - How can this be the case when Construction Phase Impacts 9.6.92 to 9.6.94 are taken into consideration?</p>	<p>Paragraphs 9.7.132 to 9.7.136 of C6.2.9 ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] detail the proposed mitigation measures that will be implemented to ensure that potential effects upon otter and water vole are not significant.</p> <p>These measures have been further detailed within C7.19 Outline Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy [APP-356].</p>
SM-22	Ecology and Biodiversity	Wildlife Impacts Construction Phase	<p>Polecat, Hedgehog and Harvest Mouse</p> <p>Construction Phase Impacts</p> <p>9.6.106 STATES - "Harvest mouse stand to be adversely affected by the loss of arable crop within which to make nests and forage. The</p>	<p>Paragraphs 9.7.143 to 9.7.145 of C6.2.9 ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] detail the proposed mitigation measures that will be implemented to ensure that</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>impact of habitat loss would be felt for the life of the Scheme and potentially be of moderate to high severity."</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>9.6.110 STATES - "Taking into account the protective precautionary measures of the CEMP, and the positive habitat management measures of the LEMP, residual effects on polecat and hedgehog should be able to reduce to neutral levels and be non significant. Minor adverse residual effects on harvest mice are considered likely to be non significant due to the replacement of lost suitable habitat with substantial tussocky and tall grassland within the majority of the Sites and cessation of intensive arable practices."</p> <p>QUESTION - How are minor residual effects on harvest mice non significant if 9.6.106 is accurate?</p>	<p>potential effects upon polecat, hedgehog and harvest mouse are not significant.</p> <p>The C7.3_A Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010133/EX1/C7.3_A] includes a significant area (approximately 94ha) of tussocky grassland habitat creation and management within buffer zones and other marginal locations which will provide suitable habitat for polecat, hedgehog and harvest mouse. Furthermore, significant lengths of new hedgerow (approximately 20km) and tree planting (approximately 10ha) is proposed. Buffer zones will be wider than existing uncultivated field margins throughout the Scheme. These measures will increase the abundance of field margin habitat of suitability to these species, including mitigating the effects of habitat loss for harvest mice. Connectivity and dispersal corridors for these species would likely increase, along with a reduction in disturbance and degradation from farming practices.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SM-23	Ecology and Biodiversity	Wildlife Impacts Construction Phase	<p>Badgers</p> <p>Construction Phase Impacts</p> <p>9.6.171 STATES - "During construction works, if deep trenches are left open overnight or high voltage machinery is present, there may be potential for injury or mortality to badgers exploring the site during the night."</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>9.6.177 STATES - "All contractors will be informed about the presence of setts via a toolbox talk delivered by an ecologist prior to construction. No machinery will be driven within buffers or materials stored in them."</p> <p>QUESTION - How can it be assured that toolbox talks will ensure that deep trenches are not left open and high voltage machinery is not present, so that the potential for badger injury or fatality is eliminated? AND How will badger baiting be stopped/prohibited?</p>	<p>Mitigation measures to protect badgers during construction are secured through the C7.19 Outline Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy [APP-356].</p> <p>Badger baiting is illegal under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992 and any evidence of illegal activity within the Order Limits will be reported to the police.</p>
SM-24	The Scheme Ecology and Biodiversity	Cumulative Effects	<p>9.8 Cumulative Effects</p> <p>Cottam Solar Project – and Gate Burton Energy Park –</p> <p>9.8.2 STATES - "The above schemes are likely to be very similar to the proposed Scheme, in that they will both revolve around the reversion of arable fields to solar arrays and battery energy storage, and retain, protect and (it is assumed) enhance the vast majority of their boundary habitats, which are the most important ecological assets. Consequently, the likelihood of cumulative effects on protected species associated with the boundary habitats is low."</p>	<p>The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			COMMENT - This cannot be correct! AND QUESTION - Where is the evidence to confirm the likelihood on protected species associated with the boundary habitats is low?	
SM-25	The Scheme Ecology and Biodiversity	Cumulative Effects	<p>9.8.3 STATES - "Ground nesting bird species of open countryside will be adequately mitigated for by the proposed Scheme, although the presence of the above schemes may combine to cause a fragmentation effect within the local landscape. Similarly, harvest mice stand to be adversely affected by the loss of arable, and although mitigation is proposed, cumulative effects from the combination of these schemes may result. Impediments to the movement of deer may be increased through the cumulative effect of these developments as they are the only mammal species considered likely to be impacted by the presence of perimeter fencing."</p> <p>COMMENT - These detrimental cumulative impacts on birds and other wild life are utterly unacceptable, they will be disturbed by these projects and there will be fatalities and the loss of some species from the area forever! AND QUESTION - What are the mitigation measures for disturbing ground nesting birds and harvest mice, and why should impeding the movement of deer be allowed by these unneeded solar farms?</p>	The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] .
SM-26	The Scheme Transport and Access	Cumulative Effects	<p>3. Cottam PEIR – Volume 2 Appendices to Chapter 14: Transport and Access - 6 Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Section 6.2 STATES - "Vehicle Movement:- (iii) Where possible, construction deliveries by HGV will be coordinated to avoid the network peak hours of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00;" COMMENT - These proposed times for deliveries overlap peak hours and so the deliveries need to avoid the hours of 08.00 to 10.00 and 16.30 to 18.30</p>	The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] .

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>Cottam PEIR:- Table14.9 STATES- "Forecast Construction Vehicle Trip Generation (HGV)Construction Vehicle Movements average per day are 60 AND From Cottam PEIR:- Table 14.10 Forecast Construction Vehicle Trip Generation (Construction WorkersLGV) Average Workers traffic movements per day are 400."</p> <p>Cottam PEIR Volume 1 Chapter 14 Transport and Access:- From Table 14.9 "Forecast Construction Vehicle Trip Generation (HGV) Forecast Construction Vehicle Movements average per day are 48" AND From Table 14.10 "Forecast Construction Vehicle Trip Generation (Construction Workers - LGV) Average Workers traffic movements per day are 400"</p> <p>COMMENT - Also within the Gate Burton Energy Park PEIR, paragraph 2.5.14, states there will be a total of 368 traffic movements per day during the peak construction period. So combining these numbers with the Cottam and Cottam average vehicle movements for construction and workers traffic per day during the construction period, gives a total 1276 traffic movements per day across all three projects. This is utterly ridiculous on the country roads, some very narrow, that it is proposed will be used for site access. Of these movements there will be heavy construction traffic and these have the potential to cause major damage to the country lanes being used and vibrational structural damage to some buildings close to the these roads. Totally outrageous and unacceptable!</p> <p>In addition Air Quality will be polluted and there will be noise and light pollution from all construction and workers traffic road movements, and site heavy machinery, this is unacceptable for the local communities and for IGP to expect people to tolerate the massive disturbance to their lives</p>	

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SM-27	The Scheme Waste	Scheme Decommissioning and Recycling	<p>4. THE DIRTY SIDE OF SO-CALLED GREEN ENERGY</p> <p>There are large production and waste problems associated with the massive use of solar panels. Solar panels require vast amounts of heavy metals which are usually mined in appalling conditions in third world countries.</p> <p>Going green is supposed to be about a cleaner and fairer planet, but clearly there is a toxic downside of renewable solar energy. Solar panels are made out of plastic, silicon, aluminium, glass and copper, with small amount of toxic materials such as lead and hexavalent chromium. The significant issue about the UK trying to meet emission targets is that large numbers of these solar panels could or will be needed to be manufactured.</p> <p>Generally solar panels have a 20 year life after which they may well be dumped and left to degrade. Recycling solar panels requires acids, which are also toxic, and energy intensive heavy machinery. Those attempting to recycle panels say it is cheaper to landfill than recover what value remains.</p> <p>If life expired solar panels etc., are sent to a dump somewhere in Africa, for example, children rip them and other electrical equipment apart to extract small traces of precious metals, exposing themselves to toxic levels of lead in the process.</p> <p>Building batteries, that are needed as back-up at solar farms, requires large amounts of cobalt often sourced from Congo in Africa where children dig it out of ground with their bare hands.</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its scheme decommissioning and recycling response to issue response references 'CJM-05' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>
SM-28	The Scheme Energy Need	Renewables Clean Energy	<p>There seems to be a great irony with regard to the UK pursuing a green energy future, because we appear to be concentrating more on renewables than we do on the one clean energy source that is proven to</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its energy need response to issue response references 'KPCL-05' as</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>be sustainable and that is nuclear power. We are currently building one new 3.2GW nuclear power station at Hinkley Point but that will not be commissioned/operational until 2027 at the earliest. I believe plans are in place to build another new nuclear station at Sizewell, but it will take maybe 15 years for that to be fully operational.</p> <p>Clearly by appearing to opt for the development of solar farms in preference to deciding to build new nuclear power stations 10 or so years ago, the government appears to have chosen the wrong option in trying to ensure the UK has a sustainable, stable and reliable electricity supply system.</p>	<p>contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>
SM-29	Soils and Agriculture	Effects to Agricultural Land	<p>5. AGRICULTURAL LAND</p> <p>I understand the Environment Secretary is proposing to change the definition of "best and most versatile" agricultural land, to include lower grade 3b land, to try and ensure it can be used for growing crops and so stop solar farms being built on it. Land graded as 3b covers 29% of agricultural land and has the capability of producing high yields of a variety of crops. Security of food production is a critical issue for the UK and it should be ensured that valuable farm land is protected. Energy security can be achieved without compromising food production. There are many potential sites for the installation of solar panels/farms, including commercial roof space, brownfield sites and poorer grade land. Land is a finite resource and so should be used for high priority activities, of which surely food production comes ahead of solar energy, the government must ensure this is the case. It is outrageous that Solar Energy UK would appear to be putting profit ahead of sensible land use.</p> <p>Therefore, as the vast majority of IGP Cottam and Cottam planned solar projects are planned for installation on grade 3b land, none should be</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its effects to agricultural land response to issue response references 'SPC-01' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			given permission to proceed as there are proposals, pending or in place, to redefine lower grade 3b land to best and most versatile agricultural land for crop growing.	
SM-30			<p>6. DECIMATION OF HEDGEROWS AND WILDLIFE HABITAT</p> <p>Island Green Power have sought planning permission for the removal of circa 55,000 metres (55 kilometres or 35 miles) of Lincolnshire Hedgerows for the West Burton Solar Site! With the other solar planning proposal's in our area 10,000 acres of food producing farmland we will be lost along with 100's of miles of hedges. As well as homes for wildlife, hedges contribute to services such as atmosphere regulation, sustainable urban drainage, reducing airborne particulates and atmospheric pollution. They also improve the aesthetic appearance which has been proven to enhance mental health and well-being. In some areas pollution has been proven to have long term and short term negative health effects. Where will the wildlife go when these hedges are removed (birds, insects, hedge hogs, mice, badgers and other mammals and amphibians?) Hedges are an essential part of the ecological system. Hedges support 80 percent of woodland birds, 50 percent of our mammals and 30 percent of our butterflies.</p> <p>The industrialisation of 10,000 acres of our food producing farmland and the removal of miles and miles of hedges must be stopped. Hedgerows are essential corridors and our wildlife depend on them for survival.</p> <p>These solar projects will decimate 10,000 acres of food producing Lincolnshire farmland and beautiful countryside. Our hedges full of nature and wildlife, our community, our well being, our lives are all under threat due to solar industrialisation. There should be no threat to having to live in and around an industrial power plant in rural Lincolnshire. Solar</p>	<p>With regard to effects to hedgerows, the Applicant points the Party to its ecology and landscape response to issue reference 'LCC-28' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			panels/farms should be installed on all commercial, industrial and domestic building roof tops, not on food producing farmland!	

Alan Morton [AS-030]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
AM-01	Cumulative Development		<p>"I am writing to alternatively, independently and formally register my opposition to the proposed large scale Solar Farm developments in my immediate vicinity comprising Cottam Solar Project as noted in subject above. My home sits amidst these numerous projects and my concern is the cumulative effect the proposed 4 projects will have on my local landscape and my resident family.</p> <p>To this end, and to be sure that my representation is heard, I share hereby a copy of some comments made to the Tillbridge Solar scheme, but which are equally relevant to the Cottam Solar scheme affecting lifestyle, property and . My note is to enlist your support that the Cottam Scheme be aware, and that the Tillbridge scheme makes a formal reply in the reasonable time as I have requested, and I shall be grateful to hear from you in confirmation of this."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058]. Cumulative effects assessments for each topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with the NSIPs identified in paragraph 2.5.9 of C6.2.2 ES Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037] (being West Burton Solar Project, Gate Burton Energy Park and Tillbridge Solar). This assessment is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.</p>
AM-02	Consultation Response		<p>"Dear Sirs</p> <p>Please be advised that I have responded to your consultation via your website. I have made some comments, which are copied below for your reference. According this direct contact with you I should appreciate a written response, as I have requested, no later than 10 days after the closure of your consultation period. I shall be grateful for your consideration of my concerns and assure that pragmatic resolution is intended through this process to protect my vested</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			interests and your ambitions; Key Comments made in the feedback questionnaire"	
AM-03	The Scheme	Energy Need Inefficient storage	"I hold the opinion that society, local and global community who consume electricity require that its' production is by the most sensible means according to need. What this does not mean is that they all need renewable sources, and what this does not mean is that they all need carbon and fossil fuel sources. Use of equipment and appliances which operate using electricity howsoever can be extremely expensive according to how the electricity is provided, either from a source or from storage and this can be prohibitive to society in general which can disenfranchise a significant proportion of communities both global and local. Whilst I can acknowledge an ambition to generate electricity according to current "clean" methods, I cannot believe that this will make supply either more widely available or at a better cost to consumers, moreover, progressively, there is a social risk of monopoly by a provider or providers which is not is the long term interest of society either local or global. Science, as we know it today, will prove that production of electricity is relatively easy whilst distribution to achieve beneficial use is very difficult. The technology by means of efficient storage is un proven, and the loss of electricity through a distribution network of modern materials is widely acknowledged as it is recorded and presented as operational inefficiency of the current and modernised power grid in the UK."	The Applicant points the Party to its energy need to issue response reference 'BLPC-03' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .
AM-04	The Scheme	Impact on historic and ancient vista.	"Disparate production of electricity destined for distant consumption is nonsensical in this regard, and I offer that support for your scheme could be more widely garnered if the disrupted local communities were to directly receive a benefit from the	The Applicant points the Party to its local community benefits to issue response reference 'LCC-33' as contained within C8.1.2

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
		Lack of community benefits.	monstrosity which you are proposing to replace their historic and ancient vista with. Fields of glass and metal are as an "industrial wasteland" unless they are affording a community benefit and you would be wise to review your proposals of production and storage to be able make such a social change rather than abuse the privilege that we have of choosing to live in England's Green and Pleasant Land. For the avoidance of doubt green in this context means arboreal, arable and horticultural."	The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
AM-05	The Scheme	Ancient vista	Please refer to your "Indicative site layout plan" areas 9 & 10. May I thank you for your consideration on the referenced plan. The noted "woodland as screening" and "Buffer to proposed Cottam Solar scheme", do afford some satisfaction of protection from the change of ancient vista that is wholly a part of the residential appeal of my properties.	C6.2.8 ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact [APP-043] (the 'LVIA') includes a full and detailed assessment that deals with both effects on the landscape itself and effects on the visual amenity of people, as well as interrelationships of these with other related topics in the ES. The LVIA process is iterative and as a result, the design of the Scheme changed to respond to the findings of the assessment to ensure that landscape mitigation is fully considered as part of the process.
AM-06	The Scheme	Water tank siting.	"With regard to the "proposed" siting of a water tank in the "setback grassland habitat" (9) this seems to be in complete contradiction of your efforts to shield myself and close neighbours from your scheme, and I formally oppose this construction and ask your to reconsider your plan."	C6.2.8 ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] (the 'LVIA') looks to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the landscape character of the Study Area and to reduce the visibility of the Scheme from residential properties and other public vantage points including transport routes, public footpaths,

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>permissive footpaths and green lane network. This mitigation is aimed to benefit the community as a whole to enhance their way of life as well as green infrastructure (see paras. 8.1.1 and 8.8.3).</p> <p>With specific regard to the location and design of water tanks, these will be provided at the detailed design stage as secured through Requirement 5 of Schedule 2 to C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B]. Furthermore, the Applicant refers the party to Table 2.2 of the C7.15_A Concept Design Parameters and Principles document [EN010133/EX1/C7.15_A] which sets out the parameters for determining the location and sizing of the water tanks, and leaves open the option for them to be situated above ground or underground, or alternatively in banded or excavated ponds.</p>
AM-07	The Scheme	Woodland	<p>"With regard to "Woodland as screening" (9), thank you for this consideration. My properties overlook the land from a first and second floor elevation therefore It would be assuring if conversion of the area 9 could start and be completed prior to any construction of solar panels planned in the adjacent fields, thus giving the opportunity for some maturity in the immediate and short term. A decision to delay such a plantation to a time post construction is wholly unacceptable and does not have my support, unless trees of</p>	<p>Whilst the Party has identified that these comments refer explicitly to Tillbridge Solar Project, the Applicant seeks to assure the Party that consideration has been made on the visual impact of the Cottam Solar Project on residential properties with regard to</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>minimum 5 metre height and appropriate density and population were to be planted and maintained in lieu? It is essential to confirming any support that I may give that the "Woodland as screening" is a managed woodland encouraged to prosper. With regard to the south east boundary corner of area 10, I would request that a mature woodland and or treeline screen be developed. The proximity of foliage as screening on the roadside and adjacent to my properties will be inadequate and impractical as a provision for screening, it will effectively blight the properties whilst the vista is destroyed. Far more effective and efficient would be a mature woodland in the south and east boundary corner of area 10."</p>	<p>landscape impacts and glint and glare impacts.</p> <p>C6.2.8 ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] (the 'LVIA') takes into account the effects on residential receptors and this includes singular buildings, groups of buildings and towns or villages. Table 8.15 of the LVIA sets out the selection of initial residential receptors for the purpose of the assessment, the reason for their selection being that the receptors are all within the 1km Study Area for the Scheme and the 0.5km Study Area from the outer boundary of the Cable Route Corridor. The LVIA sets out (paras. 8.1.1, 8.4.5, 8.6.1, 8.8.2, 8.8.3 and 8.11.1) that the assessment process is iterative and as a result, the design of the Scheme is modified to respond to have regard to the feedback of the stakeholders, including the local residents and to take account of the findings of the LVIA to ensure that landscape mitigation is fully considered as part of the process. This assessment has informed the appropriate setbacks between the Scheme and receptors and the planting mitigation strategy.</p> <p>C6.2.16 ES Chapter 16 Glint and Glare [APP-051] considers dwellings within 1km from the</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				Order Limits of the Scheme. Figures contained within Section 5.2 of C6.3.16.1 ES Appendix 16.1 Solar Photovoltaic Glint and Glare Study [APP-140] set out those dwellings within 1km from the Scheme (Study Area). The impacts upon those dwellings identified are summarised in the following paragraphs within the ES Chapter: paragraph 16.5.3 and 16.8.2 of C6.2.16 ES Chapter 16 Glint and Glare [APP-051] . For those dwellings that are predicted to experience a "Moderate" impact, the Applicant is committed to implementing embedded mitigation to reduce the effects to acceptable levels. The mitigation will be in the form of screening (immediate and long term), and it is outlined within the Glint and Glare Assessment Section 7.1 of C6.3.16.1 ES Appendix 16.1 Solar Photovoltaic Glint and Glare Study [APP-140] , and Section 16.9 of C6.2.16 ES Chapter 16 Glint and Glare [APP-051] .
AM-08	The Scheme	Loss of view. Loss of ancient vista.	"In regard to these comments I would seek assurance that your identification of these areas 9 & 10 as "potential" are confirmed as actual and in work planning as in advance of solar panel manufacture, installation, and commissioning. Please can you formally notify to me? It is unreasonable of your plan to provision that the the first floor view from my properties overlooks a sea of solar panels. For the avoidance of doubt, please understand that	Effects on landscape character will be experienced at the local level and it is recognised within the LVIA that some features, such as land use, open character and the local highway network will undergo change, but the majority of the key characteristics will not be altered, including

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			the quantum of change which your plan proposes to the local ancient vista is devastating. I am prepared to work with you mitigate this, but you must take responsibility for the loss and deconstruction of what is an historic and ancient vista of significant importance recorded since times of Roman occupation of our region, the wetlands of the "River Trent" as we know it today, have already suffered the blight on vista of power station development in Nottinghamshire. Further destruction in Lincolnshire does not remedy this."	industrial heritage of the River Trent, which is identified within the LVIA as a key feature (para. 8.5.149). The LVIA also notes that agriculture is the dominant land use, and that the landscape contains views of an open nature beneath vast skies that are often extensive and uninterrupted (paras. 8.5.14, 8.5.21, 8.5.31 and 8.5.152).
AM-09	The Scheme	Battery Storage Fire Safety Management Plan	"Regarding your "Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (BFSMP)" and earlier comments of mine relating to the siting of a "water tank" in area 9. If this proposal is "Fire water storage tanks dedicated for firefighting operations only, water provision will be designated for the cooling of adjacent BESS or ESS equipment. Tanks can be integrated above or below ground." then it would appear to be more than the "UK NFCC guidelines" which "stipulate tanks should be located a minimum of 10 metres away from BESS or ESS equipment...." per your document Appendix 03-3. If these tanks are for safety and security of mine and adjacent properties, then, I thank you for this consideration but insists that the tank is constructed to rest underground without any sight."	The Applicant notes this comment. Full provision of details of water tanks will be addressed during the detailed design process, as set out at response AM-06 above.
AM-10	The Scheme	LEMP	Regarding your "Outline Landscape Environmental Management Plan (LEMP)" Appendix 03-2 section 6.3.2 points 2 & 5 2. Withdrawing the southern Scheme Boundary (in combination with landowner negotiations) away from the areas around Ingham and Fillingham, which include sensitive features such as PROW, Fillingham Lake and closer-range views from Fillingham Castle. 5.Views considered to be of importance, including	The Applicant notes this comment.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			southwest from Middle Street to Glentworth Hall with a "superb view of this historic house in its parkland setting with distant views across the Trent in the background". With regard to point 2. I would draw your attention to my earlier comments regarding area 10 of your Indicative site layout plan, "With regard to the south east boundary corner of area 10, I would request that a mature woodland and or treeline screen be developed. The proximity of foliage as screening on the roadside and adjacent to my 3 properties will be inadequate and impractical as a provision for screening, it will effectively blight the properties whilst the vista is destroyed. Far more effective and efficient would be a mature woodland in the south and east boundary corner of area 10.	
AM-11	The Scheme	Notification	In regard to these comments I would seek assurance that your identification of these areas 9 & 10 as "potential" are confirmed as actual and in work planning as in advance of solar panel manufacture, installation, and commissioning. Please can you formally notify to me? ". Whilst I consider that mine is a " view considered to be of importance...", your report point 5. above, to me.	The Applicant notes this comment.
AM-12	The Scheme	Highways impact	Your report Appendix 15-1 section 4.11 identifies that . In the same report it identifies that speed limits are restricted to 30 - 40 mph in the residential sections. I cannot find that there has been an assessment of weight of vehicles, per speed of vehicles per frequency of journey. I raise this point because at no time has a formal assessment been made of suitability for use compared mechanical degradation caused to my and other roadside properties. I suggest to you that my property is at risk of subsidence through abuse of by heavy goods transport, both in	The Applicant points the Party to its highways response to issue response reference 'CPC-03' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			frequency and in the effect of noise, vibration and hardness to the fabric construction of my properties. Please be hereby formally advised that any proposed or accidental use of by construction traffic associated with your project or those associated with your project for another reason, render your project and its directors and agents liable to remedy of damages to my properties howsoever caused, which shall be pursued against your project according to the claims and assertions made in your reports available during this consultation period. For the avoidance of doubt, vibration caused by by low frequency mechanical motion of weighted vehicles combined with noise resultant from combustion engines can cause material damage in close proximity to building structures. A letter of guarantee is requested by return assuring that your project will not use for access to your proposed sites, please confirm that you are able to do this. Thank you.	
AM-13	The Scheme	Impact of the Scheme	<p>"Please refer to my specific points above and provide a written response with 10 days of the closure of the consultation period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This project is of significant importance to many of us for different reasons. I appreciate that this is a business opportunity for the land owner. I acknowledge that a choice has been made to pursue an ecologically friendly ambition I chose to live in the countryside for good reason. I object to my liberty being restricted. I am grateful that I have managed to achieve some consultation and with neighbours appraised your project of its affect to our lifestyle. I am prepared to work with you to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes. This consultation response has been copied and constitutes a formal response with questions which I shall be 	The Applicant notes this comment.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			grateful to receive your written answer to, whilst we continue to work together. Thank you"	

Katrina Morton [AS-031]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
KM-01	The Scheme Cumulative Development	Cumulative Effects	<p>"1. Cumulative Adverse Effect on the landscape character and visual amenity</p> <p>1.1 The Examining Authority and Planning Inspectorate is clearly aware of the other nationally significant infrastructure projects that are being proposed for West Lindsey, as well as others in and around the county of Lincolnshire. 1.2 Island Green Power is the company behind both Cottam Solar and West Burton projects. The Planning Inspectorate, for expediency in administration, has facilitated meetings with both of the companies behind these projects. It has also had meetings where representatives from all four applicants have been present. 1.3 Pinsent Masons is representing all four applicants. At a meeting on 30 September 2022, they offered a submission to the Planning Inspectorate with suggestions about the management of the DCO examination process. One of the topics was the applicants' approach to written submissions to examination, suggesting 'all applicants work collaboratively where possible'. The rationale given, 'to ensure the responses are aligned, the same information is submitted into each examination and the risk for inconsistency is reduced'. 1.4 This applicant has worked with the other proposed solar projects to coordinate work in such areas as construction phasing, grid connections and start of operation. When Cottam Solar registered as an interested party (for Gate Burton) part of the rationale was "the commonality of certain stakeholders and the potential for similar or cumulative environmental effects and coordination of mitigation measures"</p> <p>1.5 There is a clear interrelationship with the applicant and the other National Infrastructure Projects, yet Island Green Power has been able to make two separate submissions. All four proposals are to be examined by a different Examining Authority, who will only have responsibility for examining their own case. 1.6 In isolation, all of these projects may meet this requirement. However, should the proposals be given the green light this would result in</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058]. Cumulative effects assessments for each topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with the NSIPs identified in paragraph 2.5.9 of C6.2.2 ES Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037] (being West Burton Solar Project, Gate Burton Energy Park and Tillbridge Solar). This assessment is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>many thousands of acres of agricultural and recreational land in West Lindsey being covered in millions of solar panels, the construction of Battery Energy Storage Systems and the reconfiguration of a landscape for at least 40 years. Reference has probably been made to the combined areas being the largest solar farm in Europe. 1.7 My objection is that the clear interrelationship between these projects and the cumulative impact of them all is not being considered as a whole. 1.8 Should these solar projects be approved, this would not simply be a case of the West-Lindsey area of Lincolnshire 'taking one for the team', in terms of our contribution to net zero, but apparently becoming the solar farm capital of the UK. In a representation produced by Solar Media Ltd (2022) entitled The UK solar (Non-LPA) site capacity under development, it shows of the planned 17 GWp-dc capacity by region, the East Midland has 5.3 GW. This is the biggest capacity hosted by any region in the United Kingdom. Much of this would seem to be in Lincolnshire. I believe this is a disproportionate burden the communities of West Lindsey would have to bear."</p>	
KM-02	The Scheme	Landscape Effects	<p>"1.9 As referenced by Lincolnshire County Council in their initial response of 28 March 2023, state 'By reason of its mass and scale, the proposed development would lead to significant adverse effects upon landscape character and visual amenity. The development has the potential to transform the local landscape by altering the character on a large scale...'. LCC also expresses concerns about the impact on views within a rural landscape. 1.10 I believe that this would result in the industrialization of this rural landscape. The wide, open spaces of the current landscape, enjoyed by myself, other residents and visitors to the area would be lost to a sea of panels for 40+ years; hedging that over the years would be allowed to grow to 5 metres (to provide screening); fencing around areas that would cut off access to wildlife and restrict their movement; significant impact on views from the A1500 and</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its response to issue response reference 'LCC-21' and 'SPC-03' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			B1398 Cliff Road, (an Area of Great Landscape Value). I have travelled the Cliff Road for many years and it is genuinely uplifting to be able to look out across the valley and see the landscape and skyscape rolling away before you."	
KM-02	The Scheme	Construction Period Effects	"1.11 Cottom Solar, in an environment statement refer to Planning Practice Guidance3 (PPG) at paragraph 005 in which it states that, "Green infrastructure is a natural capital asset that provides multiple benefits, at a range of scales. For communities, these benefits can include enhanced wellbeing, outdoor recreation and access, enhanced biodiversity and landscapes, food and energy production, urban cooling, and the management of flood risk." This natural asset we have and the benefits it brings will not be enhanced by a significant period of construction and millions of solar panels."	The Applicant points the Party to its response to issue response reference 'TBHS-06' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
KM-03	The Scheme	Benefits Cumulative Impact	"1.12 Cottam Solar has made the argument that many of their mitigation impacts will be beneficial. An example at Table 8.72: Nationally and Locally Designated Landscape – Cottam 1 Residual Operation (Year 15) Mitigation Measures "It is anticipated that the overall scheme of mitigation that will reinforce the landscape character where this has been lost or eroded in the last century to intensive arable farming. The new and enhanced hedgerows around the boundary of the Cottam 1 Site will help to define the historic field pattern and screen views towards the new panel areas from the adjoining Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV)." 1.13 Residents enjoy and appreciate the landscape character as it presently is! The land is managed and cared for by farmers and families. Why do we need to define an historic field pattern? We live in the 21st century. 1.14 In the National Policy Statement EN-1 para 4.2.6 it states that the Secretary of State should consider how "accumulation of, and interrelationship between effects might affect the environment, economy or community as a whole, even though they may be acceptable when considered on an individual basis with mitigation measures in place." I	The Applicant points the Party to its response to issue response reference '7A-09' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2]. Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] .

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			hope the Secretary will do this in considering the impact of the four NSIP in West Lindsey."	

Craig Pace [AS-032]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
CP-01	The Scheme Cumulative Development	Cumulative Effects	Dear Sir, in my view these 4 neighbouring proposals: Cottom, Gate Burton, West Burton and Tillbridge are a cynical attempt by connected developers to circumvent the planning process and I request that the planning authority finds a method by which they may be all considered as one project. Evidence would be: directors connected with more than one project, the same legal firm being employed by all projects and the same "trench" to be used by all. The people of this area are not NIMBYs but consider the installation of the third biggest solar project in the world in an area of natural beauty to be unfair and unnecessary. Though "we" would not have wanted the project one of the four would have been accepted.	The Applicant notes this comment. Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the Environmental Statement [APP-036 to APP-058] . Cumulative effects assessments for each topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with the NSIPs identified in paragraph 2.5.9 of C6.2.2 ES Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037] (being West Burton Solar Project, Gate Burton Energy Park and Tillbridge Solar). This assessment is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.
CP-02	The Scheme	Loss of Agricultural Land	"This huge development will not only destroy a beautiful view, irrevocably destroy wild life habitat it will also destroy good agricultural land which is needed to ensure food security - re war in Ukraine. At the Glentworth meeting	The Applicant points the Party to its food security and loss of agricultural land response to issue

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
		Food Security	the agricultural representative from DDM described last year's bumper harvest from much of the land in question as a "once in twenty-five year event" which clearly begs the question "How does he know?" We all recognise the climate is changing and these heavier clay soils retain much more moisture than "grade one land" and are therefore much more valuable than they have been deemed historically. Whereas the examining authority and the legal teams are well versed in this process we, the local people are not. I therefore respectfully request that the said process slows in order for us all to understand what we may better do to protect our environment, wildlife and food security before it is too late."	response reference '7A-15' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
CP-03	The Scheme	Heritage Impacts Wildlife Impacts Community Benefits Recycling of Materials	"If the project were to go ahead how will the ancient and historic view from the cliff be protected? How will ancient deer tracks be protected through the deer fenced land? How will there be a guarantee of benefits to the local communities adjacent to these schemes? After forty years how will there be a guarantee of recycling of the materials used in construction of the scheme be assured when this does not even exist today. Thank you for taking the time to read these layman's comments"	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its historic views response to issue response reference 'LAN-02' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its ecology and biodiversity response to issue response reference 'TDF-03' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its scheme decommissioning and</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
				recycling response to issue response reference '7A-49' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].

Simon Nicholas Stanton Stiles [AS-033]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
SNSS-01	The Scheme Examination	Examination Timetable	Dear Sir, in my view these 4 neighbouring proposals: Cottom, Gate Burton, West Burton and Tillbridge are a cynical attempt by connected developers to circumvent the planning process and I request that the planning authority finds a method by which they may be all considered as one project. Evidence would be: directors connected with more than one project, the same legal firm being employed by all projects and the same "trench" to be used by all. The people of this area are not NIMBYs but consider the installation of the third biggest solar project in the world in an area of natural beauty to be unfair and unnecessary. Though "we" would not have wanted the project one of the four would have been accepted.	The Applicant notes this comment.
SNSS-02	The Scheme	Loss of Agricultural Land Food Security	"This huge development will not only destroy a beautiful view, irrevocably destroy wild life habitat it will also destroy good agricultural land which is needed to ensure food security - re war in Ukraine. At the Glentworth meeting the agricultural representative from DDM described last year's bumper harvest from much of the land in question as a "once in twenty-five year event" which clearly begs the question "How does he know?" We all recognise the climate is changing and these heavier clay soils retain much more moisture than "grade one land" and are therefore much more valuable than they have been deemed historically."	The Applicant points the Party to its food security and loss of agricultural land response to issue response reference '7A-15' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].
SNSS-03	The Scheme	Heritage Impacts Wildlife Impacts	"Whereas the examining authority and the legal teams are well versed in this process we, the local people are not. I therefore respectfully request that the said process slows in order for us all to understand what we may better do to protect our environment, wildlife and food security before it is too late. If the project were to go ahead how will the ancient and historic view from the cliff be protected? How will ancient deer tracks be protected through the deer fenced land? How will there be a guarantee of benefits to the local	The Applicant points the Party to its historic views response to issue response reference 'LAN-02' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
		Community Benefits Recycling of Materials	communities adjacent to these schemes? After forty years how will there be a guarantee of recycling of the materials used in construction of the scheme be assured when this does not even exist today. Thank you for taking the time to read these layman's comments"	<p>Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its ecology and biodiversity response to issue response reference 'TDF-03' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its scheme decommissioning and recycling response to issue response reference '7A-49' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Mark Wardle [AS-034]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
MW2-01	The Scheme	Loss of Agricultural Land Food Security	"I believe that the use of huge tracts of viable and productive arable farmland is wholly irresponsible with the current situation with regards to food security. When you consider the other developments planned for this area also it would have considerable impact on the UK food supply, requiring vast amounts of foreign imports to fill the gap created by decommissioning active and efficient arable farmland."	The Applicant points the Party to its food security and loss of agricultural land response to issue response reference '7A-15' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .
MW2-02	The Scheme	Wildlife Impacts	"The wholesale removal of hedgerows and the fencing off massive areas of farmland will have a devastating effect on the local wildlife population with wildlife corridors removed effecting the proliferation of wildlife species that rely on the movement corridors. With all the other planned solar developments in the local area would change the dynamics of the area."	The Applicant points the Party to its ecology and biodiversity response to issue response reference 'TDF-03' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2] .

Canal & River Trust [AS-035]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
CRT-01	The Scheme Cumulative Development	Cable Route	<p>I write on behalf of the Canal & River Trust, the charity which looks after 2,000 miles of inland waterways. The Trust is a statutory consultee for the purposes of the Planning Act 2008 and is navigation authority for the River Trent.</p> <p>It has come to my and colleagues' attentions that there are potentially four nationally significant infrastructure projects proposing a cable route under the River Trent at the same location. Cottam Solar Project, Gate Burton Solar Project and West Burton Solar Project have recently had applications accepted for examination. The Trust is leaseholder of the River Trent where the cable crossing point is proposed within these applications. Tillbridge Solar Project have notified the Planning Inspectorate of their intention to submit an application and consulted with the Trust on their pre-application documentation.</p> <p>In the interests of efficiency, we should be grateful is a representative from each project would confirm to the Trust that the proposed cable route under the River Trent has indeed been identified as being in the same location for those projects (see for example Works Plan Sheet 17 to 19 for the Cottam Solar Project accepted 9 February 2023, reference number C2.4; the Works Plan Sheet 13 for the Gate Burton Energy Park accepted 22 February 2023, reference number 2.5; and the Works Plan Sheets 7 to 8 for the West Burton Solar Project accepted 18th April 2023, reference number WB2.3).</p> <p>If it is the case that the cable routes are the same, or similar, please indicate whether or not the project team are working together to achieve development consent and how the Trust can engage most effectively with the projects.</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its responses to the Canal and River Trust's previous comments, reference 'CRT-01' to 'CRT-14' as contained within C8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010133/EX1/C8.1.2].</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>If the cable crossing under the River Trent is the same, or similar, for the four projects, the Trust would welcome suggestions from the Planning Inspectorate as to how the Trust's interests in respect of that part of each project can be dealt with most efficiently. An early joint online meeting with all parties would be supported by the Trust.'</p>	

Fisher German LLP on behalf of Exolum Pipeline System Ltd [AS-036]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
EPSL-01	The Scheme	Access to pipeline	<p>Thank you for your consultation. We confirm that our client Exolum's apparatus will be affected by your proposals as indicated on the attached plan(s). The plan(s) supplied are intended for general guidance only and should not be relied upon for excavation or construction purposes. No guarantee is given regarding the accuracy of the information provided and in order to verify the true location of the pipeline you should contact Exolum to arrange a site visit. It appears from the plans submitted by the applicant that their proposed development is to be constructed within close proximity to Exolum apparatus. Such works would require consent from Exolum and, in this instance, consent would not be granted as the proposed development would restrict access to the pipeline, both for routine maintenance and in an emergency situation. We must therefore object to the planning application. My client must be consulted to ensure the proposal has no impact on their apparatus. Their contact details are: Central Services Email: pipelinerow@exolum.com Ashdon Road Tel: 01799 564101 Saffron Walden Essex, CB10 2NF When contacting Exolum, please quote our unique reference 232339, which is specific to this enquiry. Please note that you should contact Exolum within 28 days of the date of this letter in order to validate this enquiry, otherwise it will become void. You should note that the interests of the Exolum are conserved by means of the Energy Act 2013, in particular Part IV of the Act, and other legislation such as the Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996. It is, however, the Energy Act 2013 that prohibits any development and most intrusive activities within the Easement Strip without specific consent from Exolum. Exolum's Easement Strips are 6 metres wide and can incorporate other associated Exolum facilities. Exolum will be able to</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that whilst Exolum is not a statutory undertaker, protective provisions are to be provided to ensure that Exolum's land interest and apparatus will be protected and access maintained during construction.</p> <p>Draft Protective Provisions have been received from Exolum and are being negotiated. The Applicant will include the Protective Provisions in full in the draft DCO once these are substantially agreed.</p> <p>For further details, please see Status of Negotiations with Statutory Undertakers [EX1/C8.1.11].</p> <p>In addition, the location of underground infrastructure has been identified and preliminary offsets as required by easements and operator safety distances have been embedded in the Scheme design, as set out in Table 21.6.2 of C6.2.21 ES Chapter 21_Other Environmental Matters [APP-056], and in Section 5.4 and 5.5 of C7.6 Design and Access Statement [APP-342]. Furthermore, the requirement for on-site surveys to ground-truth the location of utilities is set out in paragraphs 21.3.4 and 21.3.5 [APP-056]</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>provide guidance on the required procedures for entering into a Works Consent and provide confirmation on permitted development and intrusive activities. The whole process of obtaining a Works Consent can take between four and six weeks depending on circumstances at the time of application.</p> <p>To reiterate, you should not undertake any work or activity without first contacting Exolum for advice and, if required, a Works Consent. For a copy of Exolum's Standard Requirements for Crossing or Working in Close Proximity to Exolum Pipelines, please visit https://lsbud.co.uk/wpcontent/uploads/2021/10/lsbud-standard-requirement-uk-um.pdf. This will provide you with practical information regarding the legislation that governs the Exolum. You should also be aware that landowners and third parties have a duty of care not to carry out any works that have the potential to damage Exolum apparatus. This duty of care applies even if the works themselves are situated more than 3 metres from the pipeline. Examples of such works are mineral extraction, mining, explosives, piling and windfarms. Please note that implementation of any unapproved work that affects the Exolum Easement Strip may result in serious consequences in terms of health and safety, expense and other attendant liabilities. In such cases it is the perpetrator of the act, together with any other promoting organisation, that shall be held fully accountable for any resulting damage. Should you require any further assistance regarding this letter please contact the undersigned or alternatively, you can contact Exolum using the details provided above.'</p>	<p>and secured through C7.1 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [APP-337]. The Applicant is committed to consultation and agreement with operators and/or owners of utility infrastructure that is likely to be directly impacted by the location or design of the Scheme. These measures are consequentially secured through Requirement 13 of Schedule 2 to C3.1_B Draft Development Consent Order Revision B [EN010133/EX1/C3.1_B].</p> <p>Permission for construction works in the vicinity of any pipelines will be obtained from the pipeline operator.</p>

7000 Acres [AS-037]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response												
7A3-01	Land Ownership	Land Ownership Examination Timetable	<p>Having conducted a dip check of details in the Island Green Power (IGP) project documentation for Cottam Solar Project (CSP), 7000 Acres have identified an anomaly with a key land owner as part of Cottam 1, whereby:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the landowner quoted in the IGP Book of Reference does not correspond with Land Registry records: <table border="1" data-bbox="658 580 1420 799"> <thead> <tr> <th>IGP Book of Reference</th> <th>Land Registry</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>e.g. 10 241 (Land Plan reference)</td> <td>e.g. LL322873</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tillside Limited Templegarth, Northfield Lane, Willoughton, Gainsborough. DN21 5RT</td> <td>Kevin Simon Webster, James Charles Stewart Reynolds Milligan-Manby and John Anthony Shepherdson as trustees of the C Nicholson No1 Settlement, entry date 5 March 2019</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the company (Tillside Limited) was not registered with Companies House at a time that corresponds with the comment in the IGP Statement of Reasons: Revision A April 2023 Page 75. <table border="1" data-bbox="658 995 1536 1198"> <thead> <tr> <th>IGP Status of Negotiations</th> <th>Companies House</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Tillside Limited</td> <td>Tillside Limited was registered as a Limited Company on 8 March 2022 (i.e. over one year after the Option Agreement referred to in the Book of Reference and the Statement of Reasons)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>An Option Agreement in respect of Cottam 1 was entered into on 19 February 2021.</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>IGP have indicated that 41 plots of land, totalling 1150 acres, are owned by Tillside Limited and would be available to CSP as beneficiary of the above Option Agreement. This is therefore a significant component of the CSP.</p>	IGP Book of Reference	Land Registry	e.g. 10 241 (Land Plan reference)	e.g. LL322873	Tillside Limited Templegarth, Northfield Lane, Willoughton, Gainsborough. DN21 5RT	Kevin Simon Webster, James Charles Stewart Reynolds Milligan-Manby and John Anthony Shepherdson as trustees of the C Nicholson No1 Settlement, entry date 5 March 2019	IGP Status of Negotiations	Companies House	Tillside Limited	Tillside Limited was registered as a Limited Company on 8 March 2022 (i.e. over one year after the Option Agreement referred to in the Book of Reference and the Statement of Reasons)	An Option Agreement in respect of Cottam 1 was entered into on 19 February 2021.		<p>There are reasons for the highlighted anomaly. During the creation of the C4.3_A Book of Reference [AS-016], the ownership of much of the land at the Cottam 1 Site was being transferred, however, the registered titles had not yet been updated at HM Land Registry. The C4.3 Book of Reference [AS-016] was published with the updated ownership details gained from engagement with the landowners' representatives during the pre-application due diligence process.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to undertake HM Land Registry refreshes throughout Examination and update the Book of Reference accordingly.</p>
IGP Book of Reference	Land Registry															
e.g. 10 241 (Land Plan reference)	e.g. LL322873															
Tillside Limited Templegarth, Northfield Lane, Willoughton, Gainsborough. DN21 5RT	Kevin Simon Webster, James Charles Stewart Reynolds Milligan-Manby and John Anthony Shepherdson as trustees of the C Nicholson No1 Settlement, entry date 5 March 2019															
IGP Status of Negotiations	Companies House															
Tillside Limited	Tillside Limited was registered as a Limited Company on 8 March 2022 (i.e. over one year after the Option Agreement referred to in the Book of Reference and the Statement of Reasons)															
An Option Agreement in respect of Cottam 1 was entered into on 19 February 2021.																

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of issue raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>It must be stressed that 7000Acres have not conducted a forensic audit of the information produced by IGP in this documentation. Such anomalies in a small sample of the documentation are of specific concern because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is therefore not clear to what extent IGP genuinely have access to land in order to develop the ensure project (viability and credibility of development). • It undermines the general confidence in the accuracy of any information provided by IGP. <p>Both of these serve to compromise the information upon which parties (including the Planning Inspector) can scrutinise the documentation to make a decision.</p> <p>7000Acres would ask for the IGP documentation to be verified and corrected such that there is confidence in the material provided.</p> <p>Finally, it is understood that IGP will need to revise material as their projects evolve, but the planning process timetable must also be able to allow sufficient oversight of these changes, particularly when such anomalies are apparent.'</p>	<p>The information in the Statement of Reasons: Revision A April 2023 Page 75 is correct. When the land was transferred to the new owner (Tillside), the option agreement passed with it, hence an option can be signed before the current owners owned it. No new option agreement is necessary.</p>