

Cottam Solar Project

Statement of Common Ground Lincolnshire County Council Revision B - Draft

Prepared by: Lanpro Services
December 2023

PINS Ref: EN010133
Document reference: EX2/C8.3.2_B
Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010



Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	4
	PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT	4
	PARTIES TO THIS STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND	4
	TERMINOLOGY	4
	TOPIC REFERENCING FOR ALL MATTERS	4
2	RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT	6
	SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION	6
3	MATTERS AGREED	21
	MATTERS AGREED (PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT).	21
	MATTERS AGREED (CLIMATE CHANGE).	21
	MATTERS AGREED (LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL).	22
	MATTERS AGREED (ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY).	22
	MATTERS AGREED (HYDROLOGY).	22
	MATTERS AGREED (NOISE AND VIBRATION).	23
	MATTERS AGREED (MINERALS).	23
	MATTERS AGREED (CULTURAL HERITAGE).	24
	MATTERS AGREED (TRANSPORT AND ACCESS).	27
	MATTERS AGREED (GLINT AND GLARE).	27
	MATTERS AGREED (AIR QUALITY).	28
	MATTERS AGREED (SOCIO-ECONOMICS, TOURISM AND RECREATION).	28
	MATTERS AGREED (SOILS AND AGRICULTURE).	29
	MATTERS AGREED (WASTE).	29
	MATTERS AGREED (OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS).	29
4	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION	31
	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT).	31
	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (ALTERNATIVES AND DESIGN EVOLUTION).	32
	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (CLIMATE CHANGE).	33
	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL).	33
	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY).	46
	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (HYDROLOGY).	47
	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (NOISE AND VIBRATION)	48
	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (MINERALS).	48
	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (CULTURAL HERITAGE).	50
	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (TRANSPORT AND ACCESS).	54
	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (GLINT AND GLARE).	56
	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (AIR QUALITY).	57
	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (SOCIO-ECONOMICS, TOURISM AND RECREATION).	58



MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (SOILS AND AGRICULTURE).	59	
MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (WASTE).	60	
MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION (OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS).	61	
5	MATTERS NOT AGREED	63
6	SIGNATORIES	64



Issue Sheet

Report Prepared for: Cottam Solar Project Ltd.
Examination Stage: Deadline 3

Statement of Common Ground Revision B

Prepared by:

Name: Gabriel Cooper

Title: Graduate Planner

Approved by:

Name: Beccy Rejzek

Title: Associate Director

Date: June 2023

Revision	Date	Prepared by:	Approved by:
A	21 Nov 2023	BR	TS
B	19 Dec 2023	BR	TS



1 Introduction

Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared as part of the proposed Cottam Solar Project Development Consent Order (the Application) made by Cottam Solar Project Ltd (the Applicant) to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero (the Secretary of State) pursuant to the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008).
- 1.1.2 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available on the Planning Inspectorate's website.
- 1.1.3 This SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority (ExA) where agreement has been reached between the parties, and where agreement has not yet been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the DCO consenting process of allowing all parties to identify and focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.

Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.1.4 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) Cottam Solar Project Ltd. as the Applicant and (2) Lincolnshire County Council. Lincolnshire County Council is a host authority for the four site areas, referred to as Cottam 1, 2, 3a and 3b, that will house the PV panels, BESS and associated development.
- 1.1.5 Collectively, Cottam Solar Project Ltd. and Lincolnshire County Council are referred to as 'the parties'.

Terminology

- 1.1.6 In the tables in Sections 3 - 5 of this SoCG:
- "Agreed" indicates where the issue has been resolved.
 - "Not Agreed" indicates a final position, and
 - "Under discussion" indicates where these points will be the subject of ongoing discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties.

Topic Referencing for all matters

- 1.1.7 All matters agreed, under discussion and not agreed have been given unique references which relate to the topic matter. The referencing system is defined as follows:



Topic	Unique Identifying Code
Principle of Development/ General	PD-XX
Alternatives and Design Evolution	ALT-XX
Climate Change	CC-XX
Landscape and Visual	LAN-XX
Hydrology	HY-XX
Minerals	MIN-XX
Cultural Heritage	CUL-XX
Transport and Access	TRA-XX
Glint and Glare	GG-XX
Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation	STR-XX
Soils and Agriculture	SAA-XX
Waste	WAS-XX
Other Environmental Matters	OEM-XX

2 Record of Engagement

Summary of consultation

2.1.1 The parties have been engaged in consultation since September 2021 prior to the Non-Statutory Consultation which ran from November to December 2021. A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between Cottam Solar Project and Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) in relation to the Application is outlined in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1 - Record of Engagement

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
Principle of Development/General		
15th September 2021	Initial Project kick off meeting	The range of topics addressed in the SoCG. Representatives of LCC present were: LCC Head of Planning LCC Trainee Planner
6 th June 2022	Councillor Briefing	The Applicant and consultant team briefed the Planning Committee of Lincolnshire County Council on the Application.
Ongoing	Monthly meetings with Planning Officers.	The range of topics addressed in the SoCG. The LCC Head of Planning is the representative of LCC present at these meetings.
Landscape and Visual		
7 th March 2022	Initial LVIA Kick Off/Briefing Meeting with LCC	Representatives present at this meeting were: LCC Head of Planning

	and Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC).	<p>LCC Landscape Architect (AAH Planning Consultants)</p> <p>Key topics discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions to the project team • Project background • Progress to date • Identification of additional matters on scoping • Consultation feedback • Site visits • Projected timescales/next steps • Process for future meetings and workshops
31 st March 2022	LVIA Workshop 1	<p>Representatives present at this meeting were:</p> <p>Lincolnshire CC Landscape Architect (AAH Planning Consultants)</p> <p>Key Topics discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of LVIA Workshop Questionnaires for Lincolnshire CC input • Discussion of appendices and figures to be produced in support of the assessment • Discussion of relevant landscape related legislation and planning policy to be relied upon in support of the assessment • Discussion of Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria • Presentation of assessment viewpoints for Cottam 2 and 3a and 3b only • Clarification and discussion of additional viewpoints requested by LCC

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottam 1 viewpoints were to be agreed at further workshop • Lanpro Heritage Representative joined the meeting to discuss topic overlap • Cumulative impacts were yet to be agreed • Draft Viewpoint Review Sheets produced during the workshop • Workshop Viewpoint Review Sheets with full suite of viewpoint photography issued to LCC for comment and review.
7 th April 2022	LVIA Workshop 2	<p>Representatives present at this meeting were: LCC Landscape Architect (AAH Planning Consultants)</p> <p>Key Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of LVIA Workshop Questionnaires for Lincolnshire CC input • Discussion of Study Area/Scope of Assessment • Discussion of landscape character assessments to be relied upon for the baseline • Discussion of approach to embedded and additional mitigation • LCC had visited Site to assist with review of assessment viewpoints for Cottam 1, 2 and 3a and 3b • Clarification and discussion of additional 24 viewpoints requested by LCC. These were referenced as LCC-VP-A to LCC-VP-X • Draft Viewpoint Review Sheets updated during the workshop • Workshop Viewpoint Review Sheets with LCC additional 24 viewpoints issued to LCC for comment and review • Lanpro agreed to provide verified photography of additional 24 viewpoints, subject to Applicant approval

29 th September 2022	LVIA Workshop 3	<p>Representatives present at this meeting were:</p> <p>Nottingham County Council (NCC) Landscape Architects (VIA East Midlands)</p> <p>LCC Landscape Architect (AAH Planning Consultants)</p> <p>Key Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See minutes of meeting [APP-076] • Presentation of LVIA Workshop Questionnaires for Lincolnshire CC input • LCC approval of cumulative matters yet to be provided • LCC approval of cumulative matters needed in order to run the Cumulative ZTVs • Discussion of assessment viewpoints to be scoped out for Cottam 1, 2 and 3a and 3b, also including the additional 24 viewpoints • Discussion of presentation of Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) • Discussion of approach to finer grained assessment • Discussion of LCC preference for succinct chapter text backed up with detailed technical appendices • Discussion over use of 360-degree viewer for verified viewpoint photography • Presentation of draft landscape mitigation plans and LCC agreement that they show the right scale of detail with a good balance between ecology and landscape
4 th October 2022	Email	<p>L CC Landscape Architect (AAH Planning Consultants) confirmed to the Applicant's Associate Landscape Architect (via email on 04/10/21) that the following documents were acceptable to be taken forward to the ES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8.1.1 LVIA Methodology [APP-068] • 8.1.2 Visual assessment of residential properties methodology [APP-068]

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative assessment methodology [APP-068] • Zone of Theoretical Visibility methodology [APP-068]
Hydrology		
12 th January 2022	Meeting with Ian Field, Growth Manger – Special Projects, LCC	<p>Discussion of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [APP-090] and Hydrology Chapter [APP-045].</p> <p>LCC requested that drainage strategies would be required for large areas of infrastructure, runoff rates should be limited to greenfield rates with appropriate SuDS measures provided.</p> <p>LCC highlighted that the issue of point erosion should be considered within the Drainage Strategies.</p> <p>LCC confirmed that resilience to surface water flooding should be considered within the design of solar sites.</p>
27 th July 2022	Section 42 Consultation response	<p>Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [APP-090] and Hydrology Chapter [APP-045].</p> <p>LCC stated that Flood Risk Assessments (FRA) had to be undertaken and that FRA will need to address any large areas of impermeability that may be created such as plant compounds, access roads, and battery facilities, the increased run off will need to be determined and mitigated in accordance with SuDS principles.</p>
Minerals		
14 th April 2022	Meeting with Lincolnshire County Council	<p>LCC's Minerals Officer was present as the representative of LCC.</p> <p>Discussion over Study Area/Scope of Minerals Assessment.</p> <p>Acknowledgement from LCC that mineral deposits would be affected.</p> <p>Discussion that the Scheme only affects a small area of safeguarded sand and gravel resources, which are mostly isolated and constrained deposits. Given the temporary nature of the proposed development no concerns regarding sterilisation of mineral resources where raised by LCC.</p>

		The cabling options for connection to the national grid, east of the River Trent are within a Sand and Gravel Mineral Safeguarding Area. No specific concerns were expressed by LCC given the relatively small land take.
Transport and Access (Lincolnshire County Council Highways)		
25 th February 2022	Scoping Opinion response	Scoping of Environmental Statement Chapter 14 Transport and Access [APP-049], Transport Assessment [APP-134] and Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-135]
22 nd April 2022	Pre-application Meeting (MS Teams)	<p>Scoping of Transport Assessment [APP-134] and Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-135].</p> <p>Discussion with Ian Field at LCC via MS Teams where LCC agreed that the construction vehicle routes and accesses that are proposed are appropriate, and the construction vehicle trip generation is unlikely to cause any capacity issues. However, LLC requested that the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-135] should include measures to prevent construction vehicle movements during the peak hours (08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00).</p> <p>LCC also asked for a cumulative assessment that considers all proposals in the area. This was undertaken and included in the Environmental Statement [APP-049] and Transport Assessment [APP-134].</p>
1 st April 2022	Section 42 Consultation Response	<p>Transport Assessment [APP-134] and Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-135].</p> <p>LCC commented <i>“Chapter 14 Transport and Access-the assessment included in this chapter is acceptable, it is based on reasonable assumptions of trip rates, construction duration and route assignment. The results show that the predicted construction traffic would not cause capacity problems on the local highway network, it is noted that some routes will experience large percentage increases in HGV movements (>100%) however these are currently very low trafficked routes. Details of access arrangements, swept paths, parking, storage and plant areas and a Travel Plan for construction staff are proposed to be provided in a Construction Management Traffic Plan”.</i></p>

28 th March 2023	DCO Relevant Representation	Environmental Statement Chapter 14 Transport and Access [APP-049], Transport Assessment [APP-134] and Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-135].
Cultural Heritage (Lincolnshire County Council Historic Places Team (LHPT))		
9 th June 2022	Online meeting with The Planning Inspectorate, Lincolnshire County Council (including LHPT) and the Applicant	<p>Discussion on Trial Trench Requirements. Due to the disagreement regarding what constitutes an appropriate and professionally recognised approach to evaluation trial trenching, including an appropriate percentage sample of the full Order Limits, including the Cable Route Corridor, no trenching works were able to commence prior to the meeting with PINS, which caused delay to the commencement of intrusive archaeological works.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate minutes for the meeting recorded the relevant positions on trenching:</p> <p>“LCC has requested 3+1% of trenching on site which the Applicants do not consider is proportionate to the potential impact of the development which it suggested was approximately 0.07% of the land area subject to the Cottam and West Burton developments.”</p> <p>Full details of the meeting are detailed in ES Chapter Appendix 13.9.1. Discussions referred to in the LHPT relevant representations include:</p> <p><i>“LCC confirmed that it had requested 3+1% trenching, which it considered was required in order to ensure that impacts on unknown buried archaeological remains would be avoided. It particularly highlighted the impact of piling on burials. LCC suggested that its approach was proportionate to characterise the baseline to inform decision making. It also highlighted the limitations of magnetometry surveys in the Trent Valley area, which it emphasised was very sensitive archaeologically. LCC stated that the very large sites should not be treated differently from other sites and that their size did not remove the need for comprehensive evaluation.”</i></p> <p><i>“LCC confirmed that it is broadly content with the draft WSI for trenching in areas of archaeological sensitivity identified by geophysical survey. It stated that here is no need to delay work for these agreed trenching locations. The Applicant welcomed this approach. LCC remained of the view that trenching in</i></p>

Commented [MA1]: The version of the meeting minutes quoted in this ES chapter are incorrect and is not the final S.51 Document held on the PINS website. Additional relevant paragraphs and corrections are in red

Commented [AJ2R1]: The meeting notes we received by email (10.06.2022) are different to those online. One item to highlight:

- LCC and Applicant agreed to consider a staged approach for assessment of blank areas and works that could be delayed post consent.

LCC continues to recommend that the EIA needs to contain sufficient information on the archaeological potential which will be impacted by the development to allow for an appropriate mitigation strategy.”

Last bullet point below.

	<p><i>blank areas would require further discussion and potentially remain an area of disagreement and a matter for examination."</i></p> <p><i>"LCC expressed disappointment that discussions with the Applicant had not commenced until after publication of the Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion. The Applicant responded that the availability of geophysical survey data in March 2022 had dictated the engagement programme."</i></p> <p><i>"The Inspectorate questioned whether there were any means of focussing the survey approach for trenching activity in blank areas. LCC suggested that features such as geology and other desk-based/survey data could be used to focus trenching activity but could not fully be relied upon and that staged approaches to trenching were possible, e.g., using soil strip rather than full trial trenching in those areas where archaeological mitigation can be included within the development groundworks methodology."</i></p> <p><i>"Those areas of conventional groundwork impacts where traditional archaeological mitigation (excavation, strip map and record, or monitoring) would need less trenching as mitigation can be accommodated in the development groundworks. For areas where ground impacts do not allow for archaeological mitigation during works, sufficient evaluation trenching needs to be undertaken to identify any potentially unknown surviving archaeology across the site to inform mitigation before groundworks commence (either preserved by record or in situ)"</i></p> <p><i>"The Inspectorate also queried whether some works could be undertaken post-consent drawing on examples such as the Cleeve Hill and Triton Knoll projects. LCC highlighted the need to provide sufficient information on baseline, impacts and mitigation to satisfy the requirements of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, however it acknowledged that some works could be undertaken post-consent. The Applicant's legal representative supported this position."</i></p> <p><i>"Both parties acknowledged that whilst they anticipated that there may be some continued disagreement, their goals are to achieve common ground and move forward. LCC emphasised that provided the Applicant can provide further detail in relation to the impacts of the Proposed</i></p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p><i>Development, this would enable LCC to work with them to develop a targeted survey approach for blank areas.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>LCC agreed that work could commence on trenching of sensitive locations identified by the geophysical survey;</i> • <i>Applicant committed to provide additional information on specific locations of intrusive works required for the Proposed Development; and</i> • <i>LCC continues to recommend that the EIA needs to contain sufficient information on the archaeological potential which will be impacted by the development to allow for an appropriate mitigation strategy."</i>
07/2022 to 11/2022	Sites visits with LHPT and the Applicant	Numerous site visits undertaken between July and November 2022 in line with the written scheme of investigation agreed with LHPT for the evaluation trial trenching. During site visits LHPT and the Applicant concurred that the standards of works were undertaken to a sufficient level and agreed sign off and backfill of trenches, for full details see Table APP 13.9.1.2 [APP-133].
23 rd January 2023	Online meeting with LHPT, The Gate Burton Scheme, The West Burton Scheme and the Applicant.	<p>Meeting to discuss the archaeological assessment works undertaken for the shared Cable Route Corridor—which runs between Stow Park Road and the Cottam Power Station—and agree mitigation strategy between all attendees.</p> <p>LHPT agreed that the scope and extent of archaeological assessment works within the area of the Shared Cable Route Corridor were sufficient, and that the proposed mitigation strategy was appropriate to safeguard buried archaeological remains.</p>
22 nd February 2023	Online meeting with LHPT and the Applicant.	<p>Meeting to discuss proposed mitigation strategy and establish a SoCG between the Applicant and LHPT.</p> <p>LHPT had not looked at the Application prior to the meeting, and so could not comment in detail about the proposed WSI (ES Chapter Appendix 13.7) [APP-131]. The Applicant provided a synopsis of the archaeological assessment works undertaken and the proposed mitigation. The Applicant stated a full suite of baseline information has been supplied to inform the mitigation strategy (desk-based research, Air photo and LiDAR mapping, Geophysical Survey, Geoarchaeological</p>

Commented [MA3]: Not agreed. We requested on numerous occasions a full plan of the whole scheme to ensure all fields were trenched. Lanpro agreed repeatedly to provide this but failed to do so.

Commented [AJ4R3]: Issue is with extent of trenching not with quality of trenching undertaken. I have amended for clarity please confirm if now acceptable.

Commented [MA5]: The standard of archaeological evaluation was adequate and trenches and the limited number of parcels undertaken were signed off.

		<p>Assessment and Evaluation Trial Trenching targeting areas containing archaeological remains identified by baseline information and some blank areas), and detailed the proposed mitigation which included imbedded mitigation by design (i.e. no development areas and concrete feet) and additional mitigation by record (i.e. informative trenching, 'strip, map and sample' open excavation and archaeological watching brief).</p> <p>LHPT stated that in theory they were happy with mitigation either in the form of 'no development', 'strip, map and record' and open excavation.</p> <p>LHPT confirmed that they agreed with the proposed mitigation for the shared Cable Route Corridor between Stow Park Road and the Cottam Power Station, which is proposed to be used by the Gate Burton and West Burton Schemes. LHPT mentioned that they had agreed mitigation with the Gate Burton Scheme. The Applicant understood that this indicated that the LHPT were happy with the scope and extent of evaluation works that had been undertaken for the Gate Burton Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant agreed to directly issue the proposed WSI to LHPT (also accessible from the PINS website) [APP-131] and establish a second meeting once LHPT had reviewed the document.</p>
22 nd March 2023	Online meeting with Historic England (HE), LHPT and the Applicant.	<p>Second meeting to establish a SoCG between the Applicant and LHPT.</p> <p>Three main topics were discussed within the meeting: baseline information, evaluation trial trenching, and mitigation strategy.</p> <p>No concerns raised regarding desk-based research or information acquired through non-intrusive evaluation techniques (i.e., air photo and LiDAR analysis, geophysical survey and desk-based geoarchaeological assessment).</p> <p>LHPT were concerned by the lack of evaluation trial trenching in areas where geophysical survey (along with other non-intrusive techniques) had not identified any archaeological potential (including the Cottam Cable Route Corridor between Cottam 3 and Till Bridge Lane). Subsequently, LHPT were of the opinion that a mitigation strategy cannot be achieved in areas that have not been subject to evaluation trial trenching. LHPT questioned whether there was</p>

		<p>enough information to demonstrate that concrete anchors would not impact on archaeological remains during commissioning, operation and decommissioning phases. Consequently, LHPT believed that there was insufficient information to understand the impact of the development and so considered the proposed mitigation strategy to be inadequate.</p> <p>HE stated that the areas not subjected to evaluation trial trenching appeared to be quite large and so the project contained a high level of risk. HE believed that a middle ground (between no trenching or a high sample of trenching) should be found to proportionately manage risk. Although the preference would be to undertake additional trenching pre-consent, a phase of additional trenching post-determination (but as far ahead of construction as possible) would be suitable to 'de-risk' areas that had not been subject to a programme of trenching.</p> <p>No issues were raised by LHPT or HE regarding the archaeological evaluation undertaken or the proposed mitigation for the 'Shared cable Route Corridor' running between Till Bridge Lane and the Cottam Power Station. LHPT concerned by the lack of evaluation trial trenching on the Cable Route Corridor running between Cottam 3 and Till Bridge Lane, has only been evaluated using geophysical survey.</p>
27 th March 2023 – 5 th April 2023	Email exchange between Historic England, LHPT and the Applicant	<p>In response to the meeting on the 22.03.2023, and with consideration to comments from Historic England, the Applicant proposed a programme of post-determination trenching with a 1% sample in an email dated 27.03.2023 to LHPT and Historic England.</p> <p>No objections were raised from Historic England, who recommended that this should be discussed with the LHPT (email dated 30.03.2023).</p> <p>In an email dated 03.04.2023 LHPT rejected the proposal for a programme of post-determination trenching. They believed there was insufficient baseline information to identify and assess the impact on known and potential heritage assets as required by Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, and that it was necessary that the whole scheme, including the cable route, was evaluated using trial trenching pre-determination with a 2% sample (plus 2% contingency).</p>

Commented [MA6]: However none of the rest of the corridor has been evaluated

Commented [AJ7R6]: This paragraph is solely in relation to the shared corridor. I have added to the third paragraph, which refers to the remainder of the cable route, and added a sentence at end - please let me know if now happy.

Commented [MA8]: Historic England actually said "*it would be preferable to address additional trenching pre-consent*", as stated in Tim Allen's edits to the minutes of this meeting. Please clarify.

Commented [AJ9R8]: HE stated that post-consent would be acceptable. As stated above: "Whilst it would be preferable to address additional trenching pre-consent, a phase of additional conditioned trenching post-consent (but as far ahead of construction as possible) would be a the next-best option to de-risk 'blank' areas once the client has DCO/further funds."

I have edited wording, if this is more acceptable.

		<p>In an email dated 04.04.2023 the Applicant requested further information to clarify LHPT's refusal for post-determination trenching at a 1% sample rate in areas where no evaluation trenching had been undertaken. Specifically the Applicant requested LHPT to clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - their position on post-determination trenching as it was in discord with the opinions of the Planning Inspectorate (meeting note dated 09.06.2022), Historic England (meeting dated 22.04.2023), as well as other Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) in the East and North of England (the Applicant has identified case studies of schemes in Nottinghamshire, Norfolk, Cambridgeshire, North Yorkshire, East Riding of Yorkshire and County Durham). - the inconsistency in trench sample they have required for other proposed solar DCOs. The Applicant highlighted that the Gate Burton Scheme, which lies in close proximity to the Cottam Scheme, and was referenced by LHPT in the meeting on 22.03.23, undertook an evaluation trial trenching sample of 1.07%, which is significantly lower than the 2% sample (plus 2% contingency) requested for the Cottam Scheme. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In their response (email dated 05.04.2023) LHPT stated that sufficient pre-determination evaluation was required and has been a principle of the archaeological process since Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning was published. Consequently, LHPT stated they would only agree proposed mitigation in areas where evaluation trial trenching has been undertaken (which totals c.17.5% of the Scheme). Although they would not address specific questions relating to other schemes, LHPT stated the Gate Burton Scheme contained significant areas of woodland (estimated by the Applicant to total c.23ha or c.3.2% of the Scheme) and exclusion areas (estimated by the Applicant to total c.33ha or c.4.6% of the Scheme) that were not required to be trenched (the Applicant estimates that with omission of woodland and exclusion zones not trenched the evaluation trial trenching for the Gate Burton Scheme totalled 1.16% of its area). LHPT also stated that they had more confidence in the Gate Burton Scheme undertaking evaluation works as determined reasonable by LHPT. LHPT concluded that they had originally asked for a sample of 3% (with a 1% contingency) and <i>"in the spirit of cooperation following the Planning Inspectorate meeting"</i> agreed to a
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Commented [MA10]: Revised wording to accurately reflect our position. Each site is assessed independently on it's own merits.

Commented [AJ11R10]: Additional accepted

		reduction of 2% trenching with a 2% contingency, which they did not believe to be a high sample.
28 th March 2023	Lincolnshire County Council Relevant Representations [RR-001]	<p>LHPT are of the opinion that insufficient evaluation has been undertaken to understand the archaeological potential and development impacts of the Scheme.</p> <p>LHPT highlighted their concern during the pre-application stage to the Applicant's proposed coverage of trial trench evaluation. LHPT stated that they agreed to <i>"to a programme of around 2% evaluation trenching (with a 1% contingency) of the entire redline boundary"</i> during a meeting with the Planning Inspectorate and the Applicant. LHPT believe that a 2% sample is required across all areas within the Scheme to adequately inform the EIA, ES Chapter and provide a basis for a mitigation strategy. Large areas of the Scheme have not been evaluated and so LHPT believes that mitigation cannot be agreed outside the trenched areas as their archaeological potential is unknown.</p> <p>LHPT are also of the opinion that concrete shoes are an unacceptable form of mitigation as there will be impact to buried archaeological remains during installation, operation (i.e. compaction), and decommissioning phases. The level of impact is considered by LHPT to be heightened in areas where evaluation trenching identified shallow archaeological remains. LHPT stated <i>"the use of concrete shoes in mitigation cannot be used in any area that has not been ground-truthed by evaluation trenching and found to be archaeologically negative."</i> LHPT also stated <i>"it is noted that previously unexpected human remains were found in the first few days of trenching in one area at a depth of 20cm below the ground surface."</i></p> <p>LHPT summarised that they felt that the archaeological works for the Application had not been undertaken to a standard LCC would expect. They believed that <i>"the Cultural Heritage section was limited"</i>, and so <i>"the mitigation proposed is therefore uninformed and cannot be fit for purpose"</i>. LHPT therefore felt that further evaluation was therefore required (i.e. trenching) to understand the archaeology and determine an appropriate mitigation strategy. Consequently, the approach set out by the Applicant was considered by LHPT to be inadequate as it did not meet the evidential requirements as set out in the relevant policy and guidance.</p>

3 rd October 2023	Meeting with LHPT and the Applicant	<p>Meeting in response to request from the Examining Authority in its list of action points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) on the Draft Development Consent Order [EV-018] to detail areas of disagreement between LHPT and the Applicant with respect to the WSI (ES Chapter Appendix 13.7) [APP-131] submitted as part of the application.</p> <p>Five topics were identified where LHPT and the Applicant were in disagreement. Details of these topics are provided in Table 4.5 - Matters under discussion (Cultural Heritage).</p>
14 th December 2023	Meeting with LHPT and the Applicant	<p>Meeting in response to request from the Examining Authority at Issue Specific Hearing 5 (ISH5) on the Draft Development Consent Order [EV-018] to identify options for WSI if the scheme was consented.</p> <p>Three options will be submitted at Deadline 4:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WSI (ES Chapter Appendix 13.7) [APP-131] submitted as part of the application within which LHPT will provide their without prejudice comments; 2. A second provisional WSI produced by the Applicant which includes post-determination trenching of 'blank' areas without prejudice. LHPT to provide their without prejudice comments; 3. LHPT position of pre-determination 2% trenching (with a 2% contingency) of all areas within the DCO (excluding areas already subject to evaluation trenching including the shared cable route). Applicant to provide their without prejudice comments. <p>The meeting focused on areas solely proposed for the Cottam Solar Scheme (i.e. the main solar sites and adjoining cable running from Cottam 3 to Stow Park Road), as evaluation and mitigation works have previously been agreed for the shared cable route, which runs between Stow Park Road and Cottam Power Station.</p> <p>General discussion regarding use of concrete feet. LHPT agreed that concrete feet are a reasonable and viable option for mitigation where adequate evaluation has been undertaken,</p>

		<p>ground conditions are suitable, and <i>where the depth, condition and nature of the archaeology is such that it would not be negatively impacted by their installation, compaction during the operational life of the site or subsequent decommissioning impacts</i>. The Applicant highlighted that all areas proposed for concrete feet have been subjected to evaluation trial trenching. In a meeting on the 3rd October 2023, LHPT mentioned a recent scheme in Lincolnshire where a design of concrete feet was considered appropriate for mitigating impact to archaeological remains. LHPT provided an update to the request for information pertaining to the design, and have agreed to provide relevant information if in the public domain.</p> <p>Whilst no agreement could be found regarding the timing of trenching (i.e. trenching to be undertaken pre or post determination of the application), it was agreed that both parties would look to agree a trench plan which would form the basis of the second WSI.</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2.1.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between (1) Cottam Solar Project Ltd. and (2) Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

3 Matters Agreed

Tables 3.1 to 3.15 below detail by topic the matters agreed with Lincolnshire County Council.

Matters Agreed (Principle of Development).

Table 3.1

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed

Matters Agreed (Climate Change).

Table 3.3

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed

Matters Agreed (Landscape and Visual).

Table 3.4

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed

Matters Agreed (Ecology and Biodiversity).

Table 3.4

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed

Matters Agreed (Hydrology).

Table 3.5

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed

Matters Agreed (Noise and Vibration).

Table 3.6

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed

Matters Agreed (Minerals).

Table 3.7

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed

Matters Agreed (Cultural Heritage).

Table 3.8

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed
CUL-01 Cultural Heritage	Legislation and Planning Policy / Assessment Methodology Standards and guidance used	As agreed with LHPT, all assessments undertaken were completed in line with local (Lincolnshire Archaeology Handbook 2019) and national guidance (National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3), draft National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 and EN-3, NPPF, ClfA Guidance, Historic England Guidance). A WSI for geophysical survey along the Cable Route Corridor was agreed by email on 11.04.2022, and a WSI for the trial trench evaluation was agreed on 17.06.2022. Numerous site visits were undertaken between LHPT and the Applicant between July and November 2022. All parties agreed that the standard of works were undertaken to a sufficient level and in line with appropriate professional standards and guidance.
CUL-02 Cultural Heritage	Baseline Conditions – Desk-Based Assessments: Scope and level of desk-based research	As agreed with LHPT, full and detailed desk-based assessments have been completed and have been used to inform ES Chapter 13: Cultural Heritage [APP-048], intrusive field evaluation (ES Chapter Appendix 13.6) [APP-129 and APP-130] and the production of a detailed mitigation strategy (WSI; ES Chapter Appendix 13.7) [APP-131]. Desk-based assessments included an assessment of the full range of cartographic sources, and the following available archaeological records: Portable Antiquities

Commented [JA12]: We do not agree. Trial trenching has not been undertaken across the full extent of the impact zone, this is not in accordance with any of the cited policies.

Commented [JA13]: The WSI was agreed and the standard of what fieldwork which was undertaken was acceptable but insufficient trenching evaluation has been undertaken. Until the outstanding trenching is completed in line with the agreed WSI mitigation can only be agreed in those areas where trenching is completed and the results have informed the mitigation measures required in accordance with the significance and extent of the archaeology and the impact of the development upon it.

Commented [AJ14R13]: Noted re extent of trenching (detailed under CUL-11).

CUL -01 and CUL-04 are regarding quality of works of assessments undertaken (i.e. not extent). Please suggest alternative wording if you think this is not clear.

Commented [MA15]: Repeated requests for an overall site-wide plan were ignored so that at no point were we able to determine whether a sufficient level of work had been undertaken. This section is not agreed.

Commented [AJ16R15]: Again this comment is on standard of works not extent of works; please suggest alternative wording if this is not considered clear enough.

		Scheme (PAS), Historic Landscape Character (HLC), National Record of Historic Environment (NRHE), National Heritage List for England (NHLE), National Mapping Programme (NMP) and Historic Environment Record (HER) data, as well as the results of specifically commissioned air photo and LiDAR analysis and geophysical survey (ES Chapter Appendices 13.1, 13.2 and 13.4) [APP-109 to APP-122 and APP-124].
CUL-03 Cultural Heritage	Baseline Conditions: Scope of non-intrusive survey (geophysical survey, air photo and LiDAR analysis and geo-archaeological desk-based assessment).	The scope and extent of non-intrusive survey was discussed with LHPT during a meeting on 23.02.2022. A WSI for geophysical survey along the Cable Route Corridor was agreed by email on 11.04.2022. Both parties were in agreement that the scope, extent, and quality of collected data was sufficient to inform ES Chapter 13: Cultural Heritage [APP-048], programme of evaluation trial trenching (ES Chapter Appendix 13.6) [APP-129 and 130].
CUL-04 Cultural Heritage	Intrusive Archaeological Evaluation Fieldwork: Characterisation of identified archaeological features.	The WSI for trial trench evaluation was agreed with LHPT on the 17.06.2022. Trench plans for individual areas were signed-off by LHPT between June and September 2022. Numerous site visits were undertaken between July and November 2022. The Applicant and LCC/ LHPT agreed that where evaluation trial trenching was completed, the standard of work was completed to a sufficient level to understand the character, quality and preservation, and significance of identified archaeological remains.
CUL-05 Cultural Heritage	Baseline Conditions / Archaeological Evaluation Fieldwork / Approach to Additional Archaeological Mitigation as detailed in the WSI	The scope and results of works carried out to assess the potential impact on archaeological remains within the 'Shared Cable Route Corridor', proposed to be shared by the Cottam Solar Project, the West Burton Solar Project and the Gate Burton Solar Project, between Stow Park Road and the Cottam Power Station were discussed during meetings between the Applicant and LHPT on 12.01.2023, 22.02.2023 and 22.03.2023.

Commented [MA17]: As above re level of work undertaken. The work that was undertaken was in line with the standards required, however it was not undertaken on 80% of the site and therefore this statement is not agreed.

Commented [AJ18R17]: As above re CUL-01

Commented [JA19]: "where the trenching was undertaken. It has not been made clear that trenching has not been undertaken across the impact zone as agreed. The selective approach to areas with sufficient trenching to inform mitigation of development impact was not made clear until we compared the location plans of the four evaluation reports in the DCO submission.

Commented [AJ20R19]: As above - I have edited - please let me know if now okay.

	[APP131]: Shared Cable Corridor	LHPT in agreement that the extent and quality of collected baseline data was sufficient to inform an appropriate mitigation strategy (WSI; ES Chapter Appendix 13.7) [APP-131].
CUL-06 Cultural Heritage	Approach to Additional Archaeological Mitigation as detailed in the WSI [APP131]: Reinstatement of earthworks	In line with LHPT's response to the PEIR (2022; see appendix 13.9.2 [APP-133]), the Applicant confirms that earthworks impacted by construction phases of the Scheme will be reinstated, as set out in Section 13.8 of ES Chapter 13: Cultural Heritage [APP-048] and as provided for in Appendix 13.7 Archaeological Mitigation WSI, Figure 10 [APP-131]. The draft Development Consent Order [AS-012] secures, through Requirement 12 of Schedule 2, that "the authorised development must be implemented in accordance with the written scheme of investigation."
CUL-07 Cultural Heritage	Approach to Embedded Archaeological Mitigation as detailed in the WSI [APP131]: Areas of no development	Both parties agreed that 'no development' areas were a suitable form of mitigation by design for in situ preservation of archaeological remains during a meeting on 22.02.2023. Areas containing buried archaeological remains within the Order Limits that are proposed for in situ preservation in the form of 'no development' were discussed during a meeting on 22.03.2023 (as detailed in the WSI; ES Chapter Appendix 13.7) [APP-131]. LHPT agreed during a meeting on 03.10.2023 that the proposed mitigation is sufficient.
CUL-08 Cultural Heritage	Approach to Additional Archaeological Mitigation as detailed in the WSI [APP131]: Strip map and record / open excavation / watching brief (solar Sites)	Both parties agreed that strip, map and sample, open excavation and watching brief were considered a suitable form of mitigation by record of buried archaeological remains during a meeting on 22.02.2023. Areas containing buried archaeological remains proposed for mitigation by strip, map and sample, open excavation and watching brief within the solar Sites (as detailed in the WSI; ES Chapter Appendix 13.7) were discussed during the meeting on 22.03.2023.

Commented [JA21]: The rescue archaeology phrase 'watching brief' has not been used for many years in Lincolnshire, archaeological monitoring more adequately describes that archaeologists must be present throughout all groundworks to allow any archaeology to be identified, investigated and adequately recorded before the groundworks continue.

Commented [AJ22R21]: Happy to change to archaeological monitoring - as mentioned we welcome such comments on WSI so we can look to agree etc.

		LHPT agreed during a meeting on 03.10.2023 that, where sufficient trial trench evaluation had occurred, the proposed mitigation is sufficient.
CUL-09	Approach to Additional Archaeological Mitigation as detailed in the WSI [APP131]: Strip map and record (Cable Route)	<p>Both parties agreed that strip, map and sample was considered a suitable form of mitigation by record of buried archaeological remains identified through geophysical survey along the cable route running between Cottam 3 and Till Bridge Lane during a meeting on 03.10.2023.</p> <p>LHPT request that the strip, map and sample include a 20m buffer area beyond the extent of encountered archaeological deposits within the impact area during the stripping to ensure the limit of archaeological features is identified.</p>

Commented [JA23]: "include a rolling 20m buffer"

Commented [AJ24R23]: Please define what is meant by rolling and how this differs from what has been stated re beyond the extent of encountered archaeological deposits

Matters Agreed (Transport and Access).

Table 3.9

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed

Matters Agreed (Glint and Glare).

Table 3.10

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed



Matters Agreed (Air Quality).

Table 3.11

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed

Matters Agreed (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation).

Table 3.12

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed

Matters Agreed (Soils and Agriculture).

Table 3.13

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion

Matters Agreed (Waste).

Table 3.14

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion

Matters Agreed (Other Environmental Matters).

Table 3.15

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion



4 Matters Under Discussion

Tables 4.1 to 4.9 below detail by topic the matters under discussion with Lincolnshire County Council.

Matters under discussion (Principle of Development).

Table 4.1

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
PD-01 Principle of Development	Site description	The Site description set out at ES Chapter 3: The Order Limits [APP-038] is accurate.
PD-02 Principle of Development	Planning History	The relevant planning history for the Scheme insofar as it relates to land within Lincolnshire is set out at Planning Statement [APP-341] through Appendix 1: Planning Application History Search Cottam Sites and Appendix 2: Planning Application History Search Cable Route Corridor respectively.
PD-03 Principle of Development	Legislation and policy	The Scheme should be considered under Section 105 of the Planning Act 2008. National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1, NPS EN-3, NPS EN-5, and in the light of the Government's pronouncements in respect of transitional effects of the draft NPSs, draft NPS EN-1, Draft NPS EN-3 and Draft NPS EN-5 should be important and relevant considerations for the purposes of S105(2) of the Planning Act 2008. Draft NPS EN-3 contains technology specific policy relating to large scale solar development. The Scheme has been assessed against the relevant and up to date Lincolnshire planning policies as set out within Section 6 of the Planning Statement [APP-341].
PD-04	Need for large scale solar	The principle of the need for large scale solar projects is established in national planning policy, as detailed in Section 4 of the Planning Statement [APP-341] and the

Principle of Development		Statement of Need [APP-350]; and the principle of delivering solar is broadly supported by stakeholders.
PD-05 Principle of Development	Project components	Whether the siting of the individual project components, as set out in the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [AS-012] and Design and Access Statement [APP-342 to APP-345], are acceptable.
PD-06 Principle of Development	Acceptability of Development Consent Order and Requirements	Whether the drafting of the DCO is acceptable [AS-012], including the scope and wording of the requirements.

Matters under discussion (Alternatives and Design Evolution).

Table 4.2

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed
ALT-01 Alternatives and Design Evolution	Site selection Assessment	The methodology used in the Site Selection Assessment [APP-067] is appropriate given that there is no standard methodology for the site selection of solar farms and NPS EN-1 4.4.3 states <i>“the consideration of alternatives in order to comply with policy requirements should be carried out in a proportionate manner”</i> .
ALT-02 Alternatives and Design Evolution	ES Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design Evolution	The scope of ES Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-040] including the assessment of alternatives and description of design evolution has been carried out in a proportionate manner and is considered acceptable.

4.1.1

Matters under discussion (Climate Change).

Table 4.3

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
CC-01 Climate Change	ES Chapter 7: Baseline Conditions	The baseline conditions detailed within Section 7.6 of ES Chapter 7: Climate Change [APP-042] are considered representative of the baseline site conditions and therefore acceptable.
CC-02 Climate Change	ES Chapter 7: Methodology and Assessment	The assessment methodology detailed within Section 7.4 of ES Chapter 7: Climate Change [APP-042] is considered acceptable.
CC-03	ES Chapter 7: Mitigation	Section 7.9 of ES Chapter 7: Climate Change [APP-042] has not identified the need for any additional mitigation or enhancement measures
CC-04 Climate Change	Construction Outcomes	The Scheme will have a negligible impact on CO2e emissions during the construction phase from the production of materials, transport and construction work on site as set out within Section 7.8, paragraph 7.8.46 of ES Chapter 7: Climate Change [APP-042].
CC-05 Climate Change	Operational Outcomes	The Scheme will have a major significant beneficial effect on climate change as it will reduce reliance on fossil fuels and will result in a net reduction in carbon dioxide and equivalent emissions as set out within Section 7.8, paragraph 7.8.68 and 7.8.69 of ES Chapter 7: Climate Change [APP-042].

Matters under discussion (Landscape and Visual).

Table 4.4

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
LAN-01 Landscape and Visual	ES Chapter 8: Appendices and Figures	The Appendices and Figures listed within Section 8.1 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043], are presented in sufficient detail to inform the baseline, underpin the LVIA process and to identify the likely significant effects of the Scheme.
LAN-02 Landscape and Visual	Meetings and Workshops	The meetings and workshops with statutory consultees set out within Section 8.2 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] and Appendix 8.4 [APP-076], have been effective in informing decision making and monitoring the LVIA assessment process of the Scheme to date. The engagement has been timely and has been a valuable tool in seeking understanding and agreement about the key issues.
LAN-03 Landscape and Visual	Legislation and Planning Policy	The summary of relevant legislation and planning policy set out within Section 8.3 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043], is relevant to the landscape and visual matters as part of the decision-making process and is up to date and complete.
LAN-04 Landscape and Visual	Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria	The assessment methodology and significance criteria set out within Section 8.4 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] and Appendix 8.1 [APP-068], provides an appropriate approach to assessing the potential likely significant effects on receptors; and has been undertaken with consideration of the appropriate and relevant guidance.
LAN-05 Landscape and Visual	Study Area/Scope of Assessment	The Study Areas and Scope of Assessment set out within Section 8.5 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] is sufficient to inform the assessment baseline conditions.
LAN-06	Baseline Conditions	The description of the existing baseline landscape and visual conditions set out within Section 8.5 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
Landscape and Visual		043] and Appendix 8.2 [APP-074] and Appendix 8.3 [APP-075], is representative of the baseline site conditions and therefore acceptable to inform the assessment.
LAN-07 Landscape and Visual	Landscape Character Assessments	The published landscape character assessments that are relied upon at the national, regional, and local level and set out within Section 8.5 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] and Appendix 8.2 [APP-074] and Appendix 8.3 [APP-075], are considered acceptable to inform the assessment baseline conditions.
LAN-08 Landscape and Visual	Visual Receptors: Assessment Viewpoints	The viewpoints set out within Section 8.5 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] and Appendix 8.3 [APP-075] are considered acceptable to inform the assessment baseline conditions.
LAN-09 Landscape and Visual	Visual Receptors: Additional Assessment Viewpoints for the Cable Route Corridor	The viewpoints set out within Section 8.5 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] and Appendix 8.3 [APP-075] are considered acceptable to inform the baseline conditions for the Cable Route Corridor and Substations.
LAN-10 Landscape and Visual	Landscape Receptors: Value	The judgements on value for the landscape receptors, as set out within Section 8.5 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] and Appendix 8.2 [APP-074], are considered acceptable to inform the assessment baseline conditions.
LAN-11 Landscape and Visual	Visual Receptors: Value	The judgements on value for the visual receptors, as set out within Section 8.5 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] and Appendix 8.3 [APP-075], are considered acceptable to inform the assessment baseline conditions.
LAN-12	Embedded Design Mitigation	The approach and proposals for embedded mitigation set out within Section 8.6 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] and Appendix

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
Landscape and Visual		8.2 [APP-074] and Appendix 8.3 [APP-075], of both the landscape and visual effects is considered acceptable.
LAN-13 Landscape and Visual	Additional Mitigation	The approach and proposals for additional mitigation set out within Section 8.6 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] and Appendix 8.2 [APP-074] and Appendix 8.3 [APP-075], of both the landscape and visual effects is considered acceptable.
LAN-14 Landscape and Visual	Residual Effects	The judgements on the likely residual effects and conclusions for the effects to landscape and visual receptors, as set out within Section 8.11 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] and Appendix 8.2 [APP-074], are considered to be robust and accurate.
LAN-15 Landscape and Visual	Presentation of Assessment Findings	The approach to the assessment being a succinct chapter text backed up with detailed technical appendices is acceptable. The volume of the information in the appendices (rather than the chapter) is in part due to the fragmented nature of the Scheme and cable routes over a wide area, creating additional elements to consider beyond a simple singular red line boundary.
LAN-16 Landscape and Visual	Detail within Assessment Findings	A lot of supporting information is provided within associated appendices which provide very detailed information relating to the assessment.
LAN-17 Landscape and Visual	Summary of assessment findings	<i>From Relevant Representations – RR-001</i> <i>“The Council notes the volume of information provided within the LVIA and associated appendices, which while very detailed, makes the identification and clear understanding of key landscape and visual issues (as well as providing succinct review comments) difficult at this stage. The main LVIA chapter alone is some 295 pages with no clear summary or narrative of effects to communicate the main findings, relying in cross</i>

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
		<p><i>referencing numerous appendices. The Environmental Statement Volume 4: Non-Technical Summary (C6.5) would particularly benefit from this for non-technical readers as the landscape and visual section contains a list of potentially affected receptors with limited summarising narrative provided to provide context or identity what the key issues are."</i></p> <p>Applicant's comment:</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared summaries of the assessment of effects to landscape receptors and visual receptors which will be submitted to the Examination at Deadline 1[PEX/C8.2.1 and PEX/8.2.2]. These supplementary tables communicate the main findings as a clear summary, which signposts out to where the detailed information is available in the LVIA chapter and appendices. This new documentation is aimed to benefit non-technical readers by providing a narrative that summarises the assessment undertaken and identifies what the key issues are.</p>
LAN-18	Landscape Character Effects	<p><i>From Relevant Representations – RR-001</i></p> <p><i>"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, which is likely to be exacerbated by the fragmented nature of the separate development plots connected by cable routes spread over a wide area. The Council is particularly concerned about the effects upon landscape character through changes to land use, which would be spread throughout a wide area, rather than a more focussed development plot being read as a solar development occupying a single site in a wider landscape."</i></p> <p>Applicant's comment:</p>

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
		<p>ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] (the 'LVIA') takes into account the effects on the landscape character in detail, from the national scale (see paragraphs 8.5.12, 8.5.61 and 8.10.11), through regional (see paragraphs 8.5.19, 8.7.8 and 8.10.12), county district and local scales (see paragraphs 8.5.37 and 8.5.49) to the landscape character areas within the 5km Study Area.</p> <p>Within the LVIA, it is acknowledged that there will be change to the character of the landscape at Site level and within parts of the Regional Scale Landscape Character Area – Profile 4a: Unwooded Vales (defined within the East Midlands Regional Landscape Character Assessment) during the construction and operation phase of the Scheme. For further information, please refer to C6.3.8.2 ES Appendix 8.2 Assessment of Potential Landscape Effects [APP-074]. These associated appendices provide a detailed assessment of landscape effects on each landscape receptor including the character areas from the East Midlands Regional Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>Parts of the LVIA chapter of the ES have concluded there would be significant adverse effects on land use but that they would be beneficial (see paragraphs 8.7.17, 8.7.18, 8.7.19, 8.7.29 and 8.7.37). Parts of the LVIA Chapter of the ES conclude that there would be some significant adverse effects of land use and they would not be beneficial due to the presence of the new sub-stations however (see paragraph 8.7.50).</p>
LAN-19	Visual Amenity Effects	<i>From Relevant Representations – RR-001</i>

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
		<p><i>“The scale and extent of development would also lead to significant adverse effects on views from receptors, changing from views within an agricultural or rural landscape to that of a landscape containing extensive areas of large-scale solar infrastructure”.</i></p> <p>Applicant’s comment:</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] (the ‘LVIA’) includes a full and detailed assessment that deals with both effects (see paragraph 8.4.23) on the landscape itself and effects on the visual amenity of people, as well as changing views. The LVIA process is iterative (see paragraphs 8.1.1, 8.4.5, 8.6.1, 8.8.2, 8.8.3 and 8.11.1) and as a result, the design of the Scheme changes to respond to the findings of the assessment to ensure that landscape mitigation is fully considered as part of the process. This assessment is undertaken in accordance with C6.3.8.1 ES Appendix 8.1 LVIA Methodology [APP-068].</p> <p>The LVIA includes a suite of 67 viewpoints (see paragraphs 8.5.188, 8.5.189 and 8.5.197) that cover a wide range of visual receptors, including public locations such as transport routes, PRow and residential properties. There are also an additional 25 LCC viewpoints at the request of LCC (see paragraph 8.5.200) that were agreed at the LVIA Workshops held prior to submission that are included in the LVIA assessment.</p> <p>The LVIA considers that for some aspects of the Scheme (the construction, operation (Years 1 and 15) and decommissioning stages), the effects are not likely to be significant. For example, of the 67 viewpoints there are 18 scoped out and of the additional LCC viewpoints there are 9 scoped out since the proximity to the Scheme and the predicted nature of the effects justified this position. With regard to where the LVIA has concluded there would not be significant adverse effects, of the 67 viewpoints there are 25 which have predicted not significant effects and of the LCC viewpoints there are 8 predicted with not significant effects. For further information, please refer to C6.3.8.3 ES Appendix 8.3 Assessment of Potential Visual Effects [APP-075]. These associated appendices</p>

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
		<p>provide a detailed assessment of visual effects on each visual receptor including PRoW, transport and residential receptors.</p> <p>The LVIA also considers that for some aspects of the Scheme (the construction stages in particular) (see paragraph 8.6.2), the effects are likely to be significant adverse. Where impacts and effects are identified then strategic landscape mitigation measures (see paragraph 8.6.3) are applied to avoid or reduce any adverse effects.</p>
LAN-20 Landscape and Visual	Close Range Views: Justification and Clarification	<p><i>From Relevant Representations – RR-001</i></p> <p><i>“Several close range views have been assessed as being beneficial, above the baseline view, at Operation (15 Year) phase and the justification for this should be investigated and clarified at the examination as it is currently unclear as to why these visual benefits would be gained.”</i></p> <p>Applicant’s comment:</p> <p>The judgements and conclusions on the likely significant impacts and effects for the visual receptors are set out within Section 8.7 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] and Appendix 8.3 [APP-075]</p>
LAN-21 Landscape and Visual	ES Chapter 8: Wider Highways Elements	<p><i>From Relevant Representations – RR-001</i></p> <p><i>“The wider highways elements of the scheme do not appear to be fully considered in the LVIA beyond increased traffic during construction phases, despite the potential adverse effects on the rural landscape these may have including vegetation loss, urbanisation or visual amenity through any required highway improvements.”</i></p> <p>Applicant’s comment:</p>

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
		<p>The judgements and conclusions on the likely significant impacts and effects for the landscape receptors are set out within Section 8.7 of ES Chapter: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043]. Wherever feasible, construction vehicle access to the Sites will utilise existing highways and associated access points. In certain instances, minor vegetation removal may be necessary to accommodate the vehicle's swept path and ensure visibility. With abnormal loads, there is no vegetation removal required only minor pruning in just one location at the Normanby Road 'S' bend (see appendix 2 sheets 1 to 3 of drawing no: 22-1062.SPA02 in C6.3.14.1 ES Appendix 14.1 Transport Assessment [APP-134]).</p> <p>In certain locations where existing accesses do not exist, some very minor hedgerow removal is necessary to accommodate the access road between fields, land parcels and solar panel areas. Hedgerows to be removed are shown on C8.2.3 Hedgerow Removal and TPO Plans [EN010133/PEX/C8.2.3]. 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>
LAN-22 Landscape and Visual	Existing Trees and Hedgerows	<p><i>From Relevant Representations – RR-001</i></p> <p><i>"The submission has not provided sufficient information in regards to the impact upon, or protection of, existing trees, hedgerows and other important vegetation in order for comment to be made at this stage. These impacts are not limited to the solar development areas, but associated with access and highways works to facilitate the development, such as construction access, particularly from large plant, or access points and associated visibility splays. It is unclear on the landscape and ecology plans as to the extent of vegetation removal proposed, and the LVIA implies little or no vegetation removal is proposed. Appendix 14.1 Transport Assessment also identifies some localised</i></p>

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
		<p><i>areas of hedge removal and several instances of trimming back. The extent of this needs to be clarified during the examination."</i></p> <p>Applicant's comment:</p> <p>The Applicant will submit a plan at Deadline 1 showing the indicative location of the sections of hedgerow that are to be permanently and temporarily removed as a result of the Scheme (C8.2.3 Hedgerow Removal and TPO Plans [EN010133/PEX/C8.2.3]). Appendix 14.1 Transport Assessment [APP-134] identifies some localised areas of hedge removal and instances of trimming back. The Applicant will verify within C8.2.3 Hedgerow Removal and TPO Plans [EN010133/PEX/C8.2.3], which will be submitted at Deadline 1, as to the extent of vegetation removal and the correlation with the Transport Assessment Appendix 14.1 [APP-134].</p>
LAN-23 Landscape and Visual	Long Range Views	<p><i>From Relevant Representations – RR-001</i></p> <p><i>"Long range, open and panoramic views across the low lying Till Vale from elevated land to the east, including from The Ridge Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) are also a concern, which while of a longer range, would potentially include views down onto large areas of solar development, with larger elements, such as sub-stations, being particularly conspicuous in the landscape".</i></p> <p>Applicant's comment:</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043] considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme on the local environment, including taking account of views across the low-lying Till Vale and the 'Big Skies' as the baseline situation. The LVIA (see paragraphs 8.5.152, 8.5.14, 8.5.21, 8.5.31 and 8.5.152) recognises the importance of these big expansive skies playing a part in the views across the Study Area along with other vertical elements such as water</p>

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
		towers, power stations and wind turbines. The LVIA includes a suite of 67 viewpoints that cover long range views for example viewpoints VP01, VP24, VP25, VP26, VP27 and VP29 for Cottam 1, VP44, VP47, VP52, VP55 and VP56 for Cottam 2 and VP64 and VP65 for Cottam 3. There are also an additional 25 viewpoints at the request of LCC that were agreed at the LVIA Workshops held prior to submission that also include long range views, for example LCC-C-E and LCC-C-L for Cottam 1, LCC-C-Q for Cottam 2 and LCC-C-W and LCC-C-X for Cottam 3. The visual effects for the long-range views are set out in C6.3.8.3 ES Appendix 8.3 Assessment of Potential Visual Effects [APP-075].
LAN-24 Landscape and Visual	Cumulative Effects	<p><i>From Relevant Representations – RR-001</i></p> <p><i>“The cumulative landscape and visual effects of the proposed development are also of concern particularly when assessed alongside the proposed Gate Burton, West Burton and Tillbridge Solar proposals.”</i></p> <p>Applicant’s comment:</p> <p>The judgements on the likely significant cumulative effects and conclusions for the landscape and visual receptors are set out within Section 8.10 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043], Appendix 8.2 [APP-074] and Appendix 8.3 [APP-075]. The Applicant will provide updated documents to Section 8.10 (new long cross sections) and (new schedule) to be submitted pre-examination or at the examination stage, to demonstrate how the mass and scale of these projects combined would not lead to adverse effects upon landscape character and visual amenity over an extensive area. These new long cross sections and schedule will demonstrate how the landscape character of the area will not be completely altered, particularly when experienced sequentially.</p>

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
LAN-25 Landscape and Visual	Landscape and Ecological Management Plan: Landscape and Ecological Improvements	<p><i>From Relevant Representations – RR-001</i></p> <p><i>“The proposal would evidently deliver landscape and ecological improvements through mitigation areas and planting. However, this will be dependent upon the information set out in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Outline Plan (C7.3) and Landscape and Ecology Mitigation and enhancement Plans (Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10), which should be further explored, and assume would be refined at the detailed design stages and subject to appropriate worded requirements in the DCO to capture this.”</i></p> <p>Applicant’s comments:</p> <p>The proposals for embedded mitigation are set out within Section 8.6 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043], Appendix 8.2 [APP-074] and Appendix 8.3 [APP-075] and will deliver landscape and ecology improvements through mitigation areas and planting. This mitigation is secured through the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) Outline Plan [App-339]. Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 of C3.1_A Draft Development Consent Order Revision A [AS-012] secures the production of a detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan. Mitigation, including offsets and planting, has been proposed to address and minimise adverse effects on the character of the landscape. 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 and matters agreed with LCC at the series of workshops set out in Appendix 8.4 [APP-076].</p>
LAN-26 Landscape and Visual	Wording of Requirements: Embedded Mitigation	That the provision for the submission and approval of details in relation to embedded mitigation, as set out by Requirement 7 in Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order Revision A [AS-012], is acceptable.

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
		The proposals for embedded mitigation are set out within Section 8.6 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-043], Appendix 8.2 [APP-074] and Appendix 8.3 [APP-075].
LAN-27 Landscape and Visual	Wording of Requirements: Additional Mitigation	The provision for the submission and approval of details in relation to additional mitigation, as set out by Requirement 7 in Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order Revision A [AS-012], is acceptable. The proposals for additional mitigation are set out within the LVIA Chapter, Section 8.6 [APP-043] and Appendix 8.2 [APP-074] and Appendix 8.3 [APP-075].
LAN-28 Landscape and Visual	Wording of Requirements: Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP)	That the provision for the submission and approval of details in relation to the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, as set out by Requirement 7 in Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order Revision A [AS-012], is acceptable. Landscape and ecological mitigation is set within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [APP-339] and Landscape and Ecology Mitigation and Enhancement Plans (Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10) [APP-305 to APP-315].
LAN-29 Landscape and Visual	Wording of Requirements: No Further Mitigation Sought	That no further mitigation is considered necessary from that already identified within the suite of application documents (particularly the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [APP-339] and Landscape and Ecology Mitigation and Enhancement Plans (Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10) [APP-305 to APP-315]). The mechanisms for securing the embedded and additional mitigation measures into the Scheme are acceptable.
LAN-30	Wording of Requirements: Correlation between LEMP [APP-339] and Landscape	The Scheme will deliver landscape and ecological improvements through mitigation areas and planting. This is secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
Landscape and Visual	and Ecology Mitigation Plans (Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10) [APP-305 to APP-315].	Management Plan (LEMP) [APP-339] and Landscape and Ecology Mitigation and Enhancement Plans (Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10) [APP-305 to APP-315].

Matters under discussion (Ecology and Biodiversity).

Table 3.5

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed
ECO-01 Ecology and Biodiversity	Methodology	The methodology adopted within Section 9.4 of ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] has been derived from the information obtained through consultation with stakeholders and by reviewing relevant guidance and studies and is considered acceptable in so far as it relates to those elements of the Scheme within Lincolnshire
ECO-02 Ecology and Biodiversity	Baseline Assessment	The baseline conditions which are detailed within Section 9.5 of ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] are representative of the baseline site conditions in so far as they relate to those elements of the Scheme within Bassetlaw District and Nottinghamshire County.
ECO-03 Ecology and Biodiversity	Mitigation	The proposed mitigation measures set out within Section 9.8 of ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] are acceptable in so far as they relate to those elements of the Scheme within Bassetlaw District and Nottinghamshire County.

Matters under discussion (Hydrology).

Table 4.6

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
HY-01 Hydrology	Methodology	The methodology adopted within Section 10.4 of ES Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045] has been derived from the information obtained through consultation with stakeholders and by reviewing relevant guidance and studies and is considered acceptable.
HY-02 Hydrology	Baseline Assessment	The baseline conditions which are detailed within Section 10.5 of ES Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045] are representative of the baseline site conditions.
HY-03 Hydrology	Mitigation	The proposed mitigation measures set out within Section 10.8 of ES Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045] are acceptable.
HY-04 Hydrology	Surface Water Flooding	It is agreed that Surface Water Flood Risk is appropriately addressed at this stage as set out in Section 3.0 of Appendix 10, Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [APP-090].
HY-05 Hydrology	Drainage	<p>Additional detail regarding the proposed surface water drainage strategies in accordance with SuDS principles for proposed areas of hardstanding will need to be provided to ensure greenfield run-off rates are maintained. Requirement 11 of the DCO secures written details of the surface water drainage scheme and (if any) foul water drainage scheme through a plan which must be substantially in accordance with the outline drainage strategy.</p> <p>As stated in paragraph 10.8.19 of ES Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045] maintaining the existing surface water run-off regime by utilising permeable surfacing for the Site accesses, linear infiltration trenches around any proposed</p>

		infrastructure (substations and batteries) and wildflower planting at the leeward edge of solar panels will ensure that the Scheme is unlikely to generate surface water runoff rates beyond the baseline scenario.
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Matters under discussion (Noise and Vibration)

Table 4.7

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed
NOI-01 Noise and Vibration	Baseline Monitoring	The baseline noise monitoring detailed within Section 15.4 of ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] and Appendix 15.1 [APP-137] is representative of the sound levels in the vicinity of the Scheme and experienced by nearby sensitive receptors.
NOI-02 Noise and Vibration	Methodology and Assessment	The methodology detailed within Section 15.4 and the assessments within Sections 15.7, 15.8 and 15.9 of ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] and Appendix 15.3 [APP-139] for noise and vibration associated with both the construction and operational phases of the Scheme is acceptable.
NOI-03 Noise and Vibration	Assessment Outcomes	The effects of noise and vibration detailed within Section 15.7 of ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] and Appendix 15.3 [APP-139] from the construction and operational phases of the Scheme do not result in a significant impact and are acceptable.

Matters under discussion (Minerals).

Table 4.8

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed
------------	-----------	---------------------------

MIN-01 Minerals	Legislation and Planning Policy	The summary of relevant legislation and planning policy set out within Section 12.3 of ES Chapter 12: Minerals [APP-047], is relevant to the Minerals Assessment as part of the decision-making process and is up to date and complete.
MIN-02 Minerals	Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria	The assessment methodology and significance criteria set out within Section 12.4 of ES Chapter 12: Minerals [APP-047] provides an appropriate approach to assessing the potential likely significant effects on mineral resources.
MIN-03 Minerals	Study Area/identification of known resources	The extent of the Study Area/ identification of known resources set out within Section 12.5 of ES Chapter 12: Minerals [APP-047] are sufficient to inform the Minerals assessment.
MIN-04 Minerals	Identification and Evaluation of Likely Significant Effects: Assessment of Impact on Mineral Resources (sand and gravel)	The conclusion set out within Section 12.7 of ES Chapter 12: Minerals [APP-047] that the Scheme only impacts on a small part of the safeguarded mineral resources, which include isolated and constrained deposits. Given the nature and characteristics of the project there would be minimal impact in terms of any sterilisation of mineral resources.
MIN-05 Minerals	Identification and Evaluation of Likely Significant Effects: Assessment of Impact on Mineral Resources (Petroleum)	The conclusion set out within Section 12.7 of ES Chapter 12: Minerals [APP-047] that the Scheme does not affect an existing oil field or associated mineral consultation zone. The Scheme would not have any implications for existing or proposed exploration and eventual exploitation of oil and gas resources.
MIN-06 Minerals	Mitigation Measures: Cable route	The mitigation set out within Section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12: Minerals [APP-047] addresses the impact on the Safeguarded Mineral Resource in the Trent Valley within the Cable Route Corridor and states that wherever possible cable routes should follow existing infrastructure corridors or alternatively follow the edge of significant

		landscape features rather than directly crossing open fields to avoid creating further obstructions to future mineral exploitation.
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Matters under discussion (Cultural Heritage).

Table 4.9

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
CUL-010 Cultural Heritage	Approach to Additional Archaeological Mitigation: Decommissioning	<p>The Applicant is committed to preparing a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan prior to decommissioning, which will be sufficient to safeguard any archaeological remains during the decommissioning phase (paragraph 13.7.47 of ES Chapter 13 [APP-048]) and secured through the draft DCO [APP-016].</p> <p>LHPT is of the opinion that any potential impacts caused by the decommissioning phase should be mitigated during the constructional phase. LHPT believe that insufficient trial trench evaluation has been undertaken across the Order Limits for the Scheme, and as a consequence it is not possible to agree adequate mitigation works in those areas where LHPT believe sufficient trenching has not been undertaken as part of a post-consent Requirement during the construction phase (see CUL-11).</p>
CUL-11 Cultural Heritage	Intrusive Archaeological Evaluation Fieldwork: Identification of presence/absence of Archaeological features	<p>There is presently a lack of agreement between the Applicant and LHPT regarding what constitutes a sufficient level of archaeological field evaluation to identify the absence/presence of archaeological features in order to inform the DCO application, and what works could be undertaken as part of a post-consent Requirement.</p> <p>LHPT is of the opinion that <i>“baseline evidence is woefully inadequate and effective and appropriate mitigation cannot be determined outside of the trenched areas”</i> (Lincolnshire</p>

Commented [JA25]: "in those areas where sufficient trenching has not been undertaken"

		<p>County Council Relevant Representations 28.03.2023, Ref EN010133). LHPT believes non-intrusive survey (i.e. geophysical survey) is not a sufficient field evaluation method for identifying the archaeological potential of the development area, and that a programme of evaluation trial trenching that covers a 2% (plus contingency either at 1 or 2%) area sample of the whole scheme is required to identify the absence/presence of archaeological remains.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the phased programme of geophysical survey, which covered all accessible areas within the Scheme, and informed trial trenching was a sufficient evaluation and fulfilled the aim of a field evaluation as defined by the Chartered Institute for Archaeology (CIfA) <i>Standards and Guidance for Field Evaluation</i> (2020): <i>“The definition of archaeological field evaluation is a limited programme of non-intrusive and/or intrusive fieldwork which determines the presence or absence of archaeological features, structures, deposits, artefacts or ecofacts and their research potential, within a specified area or site on land, in an inter-tidal zone or underwater. If such archaeological remains are present, field evaluation defines their character, extent, quality and preservation, reports on them and enables an assessment of their significance in a local, regional, national or international context as appropriate”.</i></p>
CUL-12 Cultural Heritage	Approach to Additional Archaeological Mitigation as detailed in the WSI [APP131]: Informative Trenching	<p>There is presently a lack of agreement between the Applicant and LHPT regarding the suitability of a programme of informative trenching post-DCO determination.</p> <p>A programme of informative trenching targeting geophysical anomalies and cropmarks identified from air photo and LiDAR mapping interpreted as having an unknown origin, as detailed in the WSI (ES Chapter Appendix 13.7) [APP-131], was discussed with LHPT on the 22.03.2023.</p> <p>LHPT is of the opinion that the information derived from trial trench evaluation is critical to inform the DCO application, and consider post-consent trenching to impose too much risk upon the developer/Scheme (meeting 03.10.2023 see table 2.1). Consequently LHPT believe that evaluation trial trenching should be undertaken pre-</p>

Commented [JA26]: As was agreed in the meeting between LCC, the consultants and the Planning Inspectorate advisors on a meeting for Lincolnshire County Council and the Applicants for Gate Burton and West Burton and Cottam NSIPs, facilitated by PINS, for a discussion on the extent of trial trenching (9th June 2022).

Commented [AJ27R26]: See table 2.1 - 2% (plus cont) for whole site not agreed in this meeting.

Commented [MA28]: This was also stated by Historic England in earlier meetings, not just LHPT

Commented [AJ29R28]: As noted in table 2.1

		<p>determination across the whole site at a sample of 2% (plus contingency). LHPT consider that "evaluation trenches need to cover known and suspected areas of archaeology and also the so-called "blank" areas because there will be archaeology which is not picked up in other evaluation techniques, for example burials do not show up in geophysical survey and in cropmarks later activity may mask earlier surviving archaeology. Unexpected Saxon skeletons were found within 20cm of the ground surface in trenching of blank areas, and on another NSIP all the mitigation areas were identified from trenching, not other evaluation techniques. Our concern is that currently there will be unidentified unexamined archaeology which will be damaged or destroyed by the development process."</p> <p>The Applicant is of the opinion that the field evaluation, comprising geophysical survey and targeted evaluation trenching, was sufficient to inform the archaeological assessment of the Scheme that was undertaken for the DCO application, and the scope of works undertaken as a post-consent requirement. A programme of uninformed trial trenching with a high sample rate (i.e., 2%) is considered by the Applicant to be disproportionate to the assessed archaeological potential of the land within the Order Limits. If further trenching across the Scheme is deemed necessary, the Applicant considers that, in line with correspondence with the Planning Inspectorate and Historic England and guided by case studies across LPAs in the North and East of England, this should be undertaken post DCO determination at a low sample, and limited to areas where the Scheme will cause a high level of ground disturbance. The Applicant highlights that the burials identified in Field G4 are located adjacent to contemporaneous ditches that were recorded by the geophysical survey, and so archaeological features in this area were not unexpected. The burials were located at depths of between 30 and 40cm and had been heavily disturbed by plough damage.</p>
CUL-13	Approach to Embedded Archaeological Mitigation	There is presently a lack of agreement between the Applicant and LHPT regarding whether there is sufficient information to support the use of concrete anchors as a

Commented [JA30]: Evaluation trenches need to cover known and suspected areas of archaeology and also the so-called "blank" areas because there will be archaeology which is not picked up in other evaluation techniques, for example burials do not show up in geophysical survey and in cropmarks later activity may mask earlier surviving archaeology. Unexpected Saxon skeletons were found within 20cm of the ground surface in trenching of blank areas, and on another NSIP all the mitigation areas were identified from trenching, not other evaluation techniques. Our concern is that currently there will be unidentified unexamined archaeology which will be damaged or destroyed by the development process.

Commented [AJ31R30]: Added to the paragraph above which outlines LHPT position,

<p>Cultural Heritage</p>	<p>as detailed in the WSI [APP131]: Use of concrete feet</p>	<p>form of archaeological mitigation by design to preserve buried archaeological remains in situ.</p> <p>LHPT are of the opinion that the use of concrete anchors is unacceptable. They consider that there is insufficient information to demonstrate that there is no impact on shallow buried archaeological remains during the construction, operational (i.e., compaction) and decommissioning phases of concrete anchors. LHPT believe that <i>"concrete anchors are part of the range of mitigation options and the use of concrete anchors is not a concern where the archaeology that will be impacted is robust and suitable for such mitigation."</i> LHPT consider <i>"that the Applicant's use of this mitigation type in unevaluated areas where the nature, depth, extent, significance and type of archaeology has not been determined. The unexpected Saxon remains found near the ground surface for example would be damaged and destroyed without investigation or recording if the area had been subject to concrete anchors without trenching."</i></p> <p>The Applicant considers that concrete anchors are a nationally recognised method for archaeological mitigation by design, as demonstrated by guidance provided by Cornwall Council (BRE National Solar Centre, 2013, P.13), and the numerous examples of solar schemes where LPAs have agreed the use of concrete anchors to safeguard buried archaeological remains (i.e. in Nottinghamshire, North Yorkshire, North Lincolnshire, Cambridgeshire and NorfolkAs detailed in C6.3.13.7 ES Appendix 13.7 Archaeological Mitigation WSI [APP-131], all areas recommended by the Applicant for archaeological mitigation using concrete anchors have been subject to field evaluation using geophysical survey and trial trenching. As detailed in Table 6.1.1 of C6.3.13.7 ES Appendix 13.7 Archaeological Mitigation WSI [APP-131], the Applicant has proposed the area where burials were identified for open excavation, not concrete feet.</p>
--------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Commented [MA32]:** Unacceptable also in this case due to the shallow depth at which archaeology is encountered and the necessary resulting impact form both installation, operation and decommission.
- Commented [AJ33R32]:** Edited, hopefully now resolved?
- Commented [AJ34R32]:** Based on conversations on the 03.10.2023 and 14.12.2023 is there potential for movement to us agreeing concrete feet if an appropriate design for concrete feet is proposed?

CUL-14 Cultural Heritage	Approach to Additional Archaeological Mitigation as detailed in the WSI [APP131]: Watching brief (cable route)	<p>There is presently a lack of agreement between the Applicant and LHPT regarding whether a watching brief is a sufficient form of mitigation along the cable route.</p> <p>LHPT are of the opinion that mitigation cannot be determined outside of the areas where evaluation trial trenching was completed. LHPT <i>“does not agree that archaeological monitoring would be sufficient without sufficient trenching results to inform whether it is an appropriate strategy.”</i></p> <p>The Applicant is of the opinion that geophysical survey is a sufficient field evaluation to identify the absence/presence of buried archaeological remains. Archaeological mitigation in the form of strip, map and record is proposed in the WSI (ES Chapter Appendix 13.7) [APP-131], where geophysical survey has identified concentrations of buried archaeological deposits. The Applicant considers that an archaeological watching brief is required to record any discrete features not detected by the geophysical survey.</p>
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Commented [JA35]: LCC does not agree that archaeological monitoring would be sufficient without sufficient trenching results to inform whether it is an appropriate strategy.

Commented [AJ36R35]: Noted and added to the paragraph detailing LHPT stance

Matters under discussion (Transport and Access).

Table 3.10

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed
TRA-01 Transport and Access	Methodology	The methodology adopted within Section 14.4 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] has been derived from the information obtained through consultation with stakeholders and by reviewing relevant guidance and studies and is considered acceptable.
TRA-02 Transport and Access	Baseline Assessment	The baseline conditions which are detailed in Section 14.5 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] are representative of the baseline site conditions.

TRA-03 Transport and Access	Mitigation	The proposed mitigation measures set out within Section 10.6 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] are acceptable.
TRA-04 Transport and Access	Transport Assessment and Construction Traffic Management Plan: Construction Vehicle (HGV Route)	All HGVs associated with the construction phase of the Scheme will follow the designated routes as illustrated in the following figures set out in ES Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment [APP-134]: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 6.1: Construction Vehicle Route – Cottam 1 South • Figure 6.2: Construction Vehicle Route – Cottam 1 North • Figure 6.3: Construction Vehicle Route – Cottam 1 West • Figure 6.4: Construction Vehicle Route – Cottam 2 • Figure 6.5: Construction Vehicle Route – Cottam 3a • Figure 6.6: Construction Vehicle Route – Cottam 3b • Figure 6.7: Construction Vehicle Route – Cable Route Corridor Figure 7.1: Construction Vehicle Route – Abnormal Loads
TRA-05 Transport and Access	Vehicle Movements: Trip Generation	The forecast number of construction vehicles set out at Table 5.1 (HGV deliveries), Table 5.2 (construction worker vehicle movements) and paragraph 5.19 (Cable Route Corridor vehicle movements) of the Transport Assessment [APP-134] is accepted and will not have a material impact upon the capacity, operation, and safety of the Local Highway Network.
TRA-06 Transport and Access	Abnormal indivisible Loads	The routes identified for the delivery of abnormal loads, as set out in Figure 7.1 and described at paragraph 7.10 of the Transport Assessment [APP-134], are acceptable.
TRA-07 Transport and Access	Construction Traffic Management Measures	The measures set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-135] are appropriate to manage the effects of construction traffic on the Local Highway Network.

Matters under discussion (Glint and Glare).

Table 4.11

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
GG-01 Glint and Glare	Baseline Conditions	The baseline conditions which are detailed in Section 16.5 of ES Chapter 16: Glint and Glare [APP-051] and within Section 5 of Appendix 16.1 [APP-140] are representative of the baseline site conditions within Lincolnshire County.
GG-02 Glint and Glare	Methodology and Assessment	The assessment methodology adopted in the Solar Photovoltaic Glint and Glare Study [APP-140] has been derived from the information obtained through consultation with stakeholders and by reviewing any relevant guidance and studies. The assessment methodology is detailed within Section 16.4 of ES Chapter 16: Glint and Glare [APP-051] and within Appendix A of Appendix 16.1 [APP-140] and are considered acceptable.
GG-03 Glint and Glare impacts	Significance of Impacts	No significant impacts upon identified receptors are predicted because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where effects are predicted to have a Moderate impact or higher the developer has proposed mitigation in the form of screening to significantly obstruct the visibility of the reflective area; • Where effects are predicted to have a Low impact, mitigation is not recommended; • Therefore, once the proposed mitigation strategy will be in place, the overall impact of the Scheme upon the nearby identified receptors is predicted to Minor/Negligible Adverse.

		Further information is set out in Sections 16.8 and 16.9 of ES Chapter 16: Glint and Glare [APP-051] and Section 7 of Appendix 16.1 [APP-140].
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Matters under discussion (Air Quality).

Table 3.12

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed
AIR-01 Air Quality	Baseline Conditions	The baseline conditions which are detailed within Section 17.5 of ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052] are representative of the site conditions.
AIR-02 Air Quality	Methodology and Assessment	The methodology adopted within the Air Quality assessment [APP-141 to APP-143] has been derived from the information obtained through consultation with stakeholders and by reviewing any relevant guidance and studies. The assessment methodology is detailed within Section 17.4 of ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052] and is considered acceptable.
AIR-03 Air Quality	Methodology and Assessment (construction vehicles)	As detailed within the Air Quality assessment [APP-141 to APP-143] the proposed construction vehicle numbers will not exceed the relevant IAQM/EPUK thresholds e.g., 100 HGV Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT), therefore there is no requirement for detailed construction air quality modelling and assessment has been scoped out of ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052]. This approach is considered acceptable.
AIR-04 Air Quality	Methodology and Assessment (operational vehicles)	As detailed within the Air Quality assessment [APP-141 to APP-143] the proposed operational vehicle numbers will be limited and will not exceed the relevant IAQM/EPUK thresholds (e.g., 100 HGV Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT), therefore there is no requirement for detailed air quality modelling and assessment has been scoped out of ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052]. This approach is considered acceptable.
AIR-05 Air Quality	Mitigation	The proposed mitigation measures set out within Section 17.8 of ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052] are acceptable.

--	--	--

Matters under discussion (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation).

Table 4.13

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
STR-01 Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation	Methodology	The methodology used in the assessment of socio-economic, tourism and recreation impacts as set out within Section 18.4 of ES Chapter 18: Socio Economics Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] is appropriate, given that there is no standard methodology for the assessment of socio-economic and associated impacts for EIA.
STR-02 Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation	Assessment scope	The scope of the assessment undertaken within Sections 18.7, 18.9, and 18.10 of ES Chapter 18: Socio Economics Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] including the identification of likely significant effects and likely significant cumulative effects has been carried out in a robust and proportionate manner and is considered acceptable.
STR-03 Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation	Proposed Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	The proposed embedded and additional mitigation and enhancement measures as set out within Sections 18.6 and 18.9 of ES Chapter 18: Socio Economics Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] are considered proportionate and acceptable.
STR-04 Socio-Economics,	Public Rights of Way	Works that may cause disruption to public rights of way, including diversions and temporary closures where necessary are controlled through the measures set out in the ES Appendix 14.3: Public Right of Way Management Plan [APP-136], as secured

Tourism and Recreation		through requirement 18 of Schedule 2 to the draft DCO [AS-012]. The measures set out in this Plan are deemed to be acceptable.
STR-05 Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation	Community Benefits	The proposed embedded and additional enhancement measures as set out in Sections 18.6 and 18.9 of ES Chapter 18: Socio Economics Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] are proportionate and acceptable to provide sufficient socio-economic, tourism and recreational benefits.

Matters under discussion (Soils and Agriculture).

Table 4.14

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
SAA-01 Soils and Agriculture	Baseline Conditions	The baseline conditions detailed within Section 19.8 of ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [APP-054] and within Appendix 19.1 [APP-145] are representative of the site conditions within Lincolnshire County.
SAA-02 Soils and Agriculture	Methodology and Assessment	The assessment methodology detailed within Section 19.6 of ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [APP-054] is considered acceptable.
SAA-03 Soils and Agriculture	Assessment Outcomes – impacts to ALC graded land and soil quality	Natural England document Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land (TIN049) https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35012 explains the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) system and its use in informing land use planning decisions for agricultural land. The Applicant has submitted an ALC assessment for agricultural land within the Sites showing it is predominantly ALC Grade 3b, not best and most versatile agricultural land.

		<p>The Scheme will not result in a permanent loss of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Scheme will be decommissioned at the end of its operational life; • Land will retain its existing Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grade baseline after decommissioning of the Scheme as set out at Section 19.10 of ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [APP-054]; • The Scheme will have minimal impacts on soil quality as set out at Section 19.10 of ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [APP-054]; <p>A Soil Management Plan (SMP) will be included within the agreed Construction, Operational and Decommissioning Environmental Management Plans (CEMP, OEMP, DEMP) with the aim of conserving the soil resource and its functional capacity for support of agricultural production as set out at paragraph 19.10.1 of ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [APP-054].</p>
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Matters under discussion (Waste).

Table 3.15

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
WAS-01 Waste	Waste Policy	Applicable waste policy is set out within Section 20.3 of ES Chapter 20: Waste [APP-055] and is therefore considered acceptable.
WAS-02 Waste	Waste Site Safeguarding	The Order Limits as set out in the Location Plan [APP-005] confirm no existing or safeguarded proposed waste sites are impacted by the location of the Scheme.
WAS-03	Assessment scope	The scope of the assessment undertaken within Sections 20.7, 20.9, and 20.10 of ES Chapter 20: Waste [APP-055] including the identification of likely significant effects and

Waste		likely significant cumulative effects has been carried out in a robust and proportionate manner and is considered acceptable.
WAS-04 Waste	Proposed Mitigation	The proposed embedded and additional mitigation measures as set out within Sections 20.6 and 20.9 of ES Chapter 20: Waste [APP-055] are considered proportionate and acceptable.

Matters under discussion (Other Environmental Matters).

Table 4.16

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
OEM-01 Other Environmental Matters	Electromagnetic Fields	The technical reporting in paragraphs 21.2.3 to 21.2.9 in ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056] is sufficient to demonstrate there are no adverse impacts to human health from electromagnetic fields.
OEM-02 Other Environmental Matters	Telecommunications, Utilities and Television Receptors	The information provided within Section 21.3 of ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056] is sufficient, and the protective mitigation measures set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [APP-337]; Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [APP-353] and Crossing Schedule [APP-354] are appropriate and therefore acceptable. Protective provisions for the protection of electricity, gas, water and sewerage undertakers and operators of electronic communications code networks are included in Parts 1 and 2 of Schedule 16 to the draft DCO [AS-012] and, where relevant, bespoke protective provisions are being negotiated or have been agreed to protect the assets of statutory undertakers that interface with the Scheme.

OEM-03 Other Environmental Matters	Major Accidents and Disasters (excluding fire safety)	The scope and methodology of the assessment undertaken throughout the ES and signposted within Section 21.6 of ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056] including the identification of likely significant effects and likely significant cumulative effects has been carried out in a robust and proportionate manner and is considered acceptable.
OEM-04 Other Environmental Matters	Major Accidents and Disasters (fire safety)	The assessment undertaken and relevant mitigation measures provided with regard to fire safety as set out within Section 21.6 of ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056] and as set out in the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan [APP-348] have been carried out in a robust and proportionate manner and are acceptable. The design of the BESS is suitable to address the requirements of the Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service.
OEM-05 Other Environmental Matters	Human Health	The scope and methodology of the assessment undertaken throughout the ES and signposted in Section 21.5 of ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056] including the identification of likely significant effects and likely significant cumulative effects has been carried out in a robust and proportionate manner and is considered acceptable.



5 Matters Not Agreed

There are currently no matters not agreed with Lincolnshire County Council.



6 Signatories

6.1.1 The above SoCG is agreed between Cottam Solar Project Ltd. (the Applicant) and Lincolnshire County Council, as specified below.

Duly authorised for and on behalf of Cottam Solar Project Ltd.

Name:	
Job Title:	
Date:	
Signature:	

Duly authorised for and on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council.

Name:	
Job Title:	
Date:	
Signature:	