

Cottam Solar Project

Applicant's Responses to ExA Second Written Questions

Prepared by: Lanpro Services Ltd
January 2024

PINS reference: EN010133
Document reference: EX4/C8.1.30
Rule 8(1)(b)



Contents

<u>1</u>	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>2</u>	<u>THE DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER AND OTHER CONSENTS</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>GENERAL AND CROSS-TOPIC MATTERS</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>4</u>	<u>THE NEED CASE, ELECTRICITY GENERATED AND CLIMATE CHANGE</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>OTHER PROJECTS AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>6</u>	<u>LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL, GLINT AND GLARE, GOOD DESIGN</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>7</u>	<u>BIODIVERSITY AND THE HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>34</u>
<u>8</u>	<u>THE WATER ENVIRONMENT</u>	<u>36</u>
<u>9</u>	<u>SOILS AND AGRICULTURE</u>	<u>40</u>
<u>10</u>	<u>THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT</u>	<u>43</u>
<u>11</u>	<u>TRANSPORT AND ACCESS, HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY</u>	<u>55</u>
<u>12</u>	<u>NOISE, VIBRATION, AIR QUALITY, AND NUISANCE</u>	<u>59</u>
<u>13</u>	<u>SOCIO-ECONOMICS, TOURISM, AND RECREATION</u>	<u>62</u>
<u>14</u>	<u>OTHER PLANNING MATTERS</u>	<u>67</u>
<u>15</u>	<u>COMPULSORY ACQUISITION AND RELATED MATTERS</u>	<u>76</u>
	<u>APPENDIX A</u>	<u>79</u>
	<u>APPENDIX B</u>	<u>85</u>

Issue Sheet

Report Prepared for: Cottam Solar Project Ltd.
Examination Deadline 4

Applicant's Responses to ExA Second Written Questions

Prepared by:

Name: Aidan Van de Weyer

Title: Senior Planner

Approved by:

Name: Beccy Rejzek

Title: Associate Director

Revision	Date	Prepared by:	Approved by:
original	30 Jan 2024	AV	BR

1 Introduction

This report responds to the Examining Authority's (ExA) second written questions, issued on 16 January 2024 [PD-015]. It responds to each of the questions posed to the Applicant. The Applicant has not responded to questions posed to specific Interested Parties but will review those responses once available and may comment on those at Deadline 5.

The following sections of this report is tabularised to include the ExA's questions and a response to each question as follows:

- The draft Development Consent Order and other consents
- General and cross-topic matters
- The need case, electricity generated and climate change
- Other projects and cumulative effects
- Landscape and visual, glint and glare, good design
- Biodiversity and the Habitats Regulations Assessment
- The water environment
- Soils and agriculture
- The historic environment
- Transport and access, highways and public rights of way
- Noise, vibration, air quality, and nuisance
- Socio-economics, tourism, and recreation
- Other planning matters
- Compulsory Acquisition and related matters

2 The draft Development Consent Order and other consents

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.1.1	Environment Agency (EA)/Applicant	<p>Article 6 (Application and modification of statutory provisions)</p> <p>Please provide an update on discussions regarding the disapplication of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations and the drafting of the Protective Provisions (PPs) for the benefit of the EA (and identify any outstanding matters).</p>	<p>The Environment Agency (EA) has confirmed by email of 24 January 2024 that the Protective Provisions within the draft DCO [REP3-003] are agreed. Subject to the inclusion of these Protective Provisions within the DCO, the EA has confirmed it agrees to the disapplication provisions in article 6(1)(f) and (h) of version C of the draft DCO [REP3-003].</p> <p>In response to concerns raised by the EA, the Applicant has removed the provisions previously included at article 6(1)(d) and (e), which sought to disapply sections 24 and 25 of the Water Resources Act 1991, from version D of the draft DCO provided at Deadline 4 [EX4/C3.1].</p>
2.1.2	Applicant/Lincolnshire County Council (LCC)	<p>Article 9 (Power to alter layout etc., of streets)</p> <p>Please provide an update on discussions on LCC's concerns regarding the level of detail provided for highway works and the works set out in Schedule 5.</p> <p>Where alternative drafting is proposed by LCC, please provide details.</p>	<p>In response to concerns raised by the Highway Authority, the Applicant amended the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) at Deadline 3 [REP3-007] to include a number of obligations to ensure that the final plans would include the level of technical detail required. Section 3.5 of the Outline CTMP [REP3-007] requires the plan to include the typical information included in a section 278 agreement including a programme of works, technical drawings, health and safety documentation, safety audits and details of the contractor. As that document (the CTMP) will need to be approved, the Applicant's position is that the approval mechanism is</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			included in the requirement discharge, so there is no need for a separate approval mechanism in the article itself. The Applicant understands that LCC is considering the drafting of the Outline CTMP and will send any comments to the Applicant.
2.1.3	Applicant/LCC	Article 15 (Traffic regulation measures) Please provide an update on discussions in relation to this Article. Where alternative drafting is proposed by LCC, please provide details.	Please refer to the response to 2.1.2, above. In addition to the requirement to provide technical details, section 3.6 of the Outline CTMP requires the details of the form and proposed location of any signs to be placed in accordance with article 15 to be submitted to the traffic authority in advance. In response to comments made by LCC at the West Burton Solar Project Examination, the Applicant has amended the Outline CTMP submitted at Deadline 4 [EX4/C6.3.14.2_E] to require the signs to be approved by the traffic authority.
2.1.4	Applicant/LCC	Article 38 (Felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows) Please provide an update on discussions regarding this article. Where alternative drafting is proposed by LCC, please provide details.	PINS Advice Note 15, Section 22, provides for two ways to manage hedgerow removals, in order to remove the requirement to obtain a separate consent under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Either a schedule or plan identifying the hedgerows to be removed is to be provided; or the DCO may contain a general power specifying that hedgerows can be removed, subject to the later consent of the local authority. The Applicant has adopted a hybrid approach, as flexibility is required as it is only following the detailed design for the Cable Route Corridor and the access points that the exact location of the hedgerow removal works will be known.

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Article 38(4) of the draft Development Consent Order [EX4/C3.1] provides the Applicant with the power to remove part of the hedgerows listed in Schedule 13 to the draft DCO, but only "to the extent set out in the landscape and ecological management plan". This plan must be approved by the relevant planning authority pursuant to Requirement 7 of Schedule 2 to the draft DCO [EX4/C3.1].</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact [REP2-009] includes the retention and enhancement of trees and hedgerows as embedded mitigation. C7.3 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan D [EX4/C7.3_E] (the 'OLEMP') sets out in paragraph 1.1.5 that wherever feasible, the Scheme utilises existing access points to accommodate access between fields, land areas, solar panel areas, substation sites and battery storage areas within the Order limits. The indicative extent of hedgerow removal is set out in Appendix C – Hedgerow Removal Plans of the OLEMP. Any minor hedgerow works (pruning, lopping and minor removals) associated with the Scheme, including highways improvements and access for construction, will be clarified in the final LEMP). The Applicant therefore considers that it has complied with Advice Note 15. Where the exact details of the hedgerow works cannot yet be confirmed, any removal work will be subject to later consent through the approval of the final version of the LEMP pursuant to Requirement 7.</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.1.5	Crown Estate Commissioners/Applicant	<p>Article 49 (Crown Land)</p> <p>Please provide an update on discussions in relation to section 135 of the PA 2008 and the request for consent including potential outcomes and whether agreement is likely to be reached before the close of the Examination.</p>	<p>The Applicant is engaged with solicitors acting for The Crown Estate in relation to obtaining necessary Crown consents pursuant to s135(1) and (2) and is confident that these will be obtained during the course of Examination.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that s135 consent has been issued by The Crown Estate for the crossing of the River Trent for the Gate Burton Examination (noting that this was submitted on 30 November 2023 towards the end of the Examination).</p>
2.1.6	WLDC	<p>Schedule 2 – General</p> <p>Please explain why WLDC considers a phasing requirement is necessary and provide any proposed wording.</p>	
2.1.7	Applicant	<p>Schedule 2 – General</p> <p>Please comment on WLDC's suggestion for a phasing requirement to be included in the dDCO (see WLDC's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH5 [REP3-057].</p>	<p>In response to this suggestion, the Applicant has updated Requirement 2 of Schedule 2 to the draft Development Consent Order [EX4/C3.1] to require a written scheme setting out the phase or phases of construction to be submitted to the relevant planning authorities. The scheme must include a timetable for construction of each phase, and a plan identifying the phasing area.</p>
2.1.8	WLDC	<p>Schedule 2 – General</p> <p>Please identify other made DCO's which contain similar retention clauses</p>	

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		to those proposed by WLDC and include any suggested wording.	
2.1.9	Applicant	<p>Requirement 9 (Biodiversity Net Gain)</p> <p>The ExA notes the Applicant's comments at ISH5 that different approaches are being taken in other NSIP examinations (referencing the Mallard Pass and Gate Burton projects) in relation to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). Please can the Applicant confirm that the approach taken for the Proposed Development is similar to those recently closed examinations or whether a different approach is being taken here.</p>	<p>The Applicant has updated Requirement 9 (biodiversity net gain) of Schedule 2 to the draft Development Consent Order [EX4/C3.1], and now reflects the approach taken in the final draft DCO submitted as part of the Mallard Pass Solar Farm examination. The revised drafting includes a minimum of 10% BNG for river units; the Applicant is currently considering the specific minimum % that will be required for habitat and hedgerow units to allow for sufficient flexibility for any future changes to the metric and the detailed design of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that this is an evolving area and there is currently no standard approach. For example, the requirement in the Gate Burton Energy Park draft DCO does not specify a percentage and the Sunnica Energy Farm draft DCO (currently with the Secretary of State for determination) refers to a minimum of 10%.</p>
2.1.10	Applicant	<p>Requirement 9 (BNG)</p> <p>At ISH5, the Applicant explained that the specific percentages of BNG identified in the ES were not secured in the dDCO and should not be relied on by the SoS in the planning balance.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Applicant's response to 2.1.9. Minimum percentages of BNG are now secured within the draft DCO, subject to flexibility to accommodate changes to the BNG metric for the Scheme and to allow for differences as a result of the detailed design.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the revised drafting, the Applicant's position is that it has committed to delivering all of the</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>However, at action point 6 of ISH2, the Applicant draws attention to section 4.6 of its Planning Statement which sets out the benefits of the scheme the Applicant considers should be attributed significant weight in the planning balance, including 'a significant net gain for biodiversity, with 96.09% gains provided in habitat, 20.22% gains in hedgerow and 10.69% gains in river units'. Please explain why the Applicant considers significant weight should be attributed to BNG where these levels (or any minimum amounts) are not secured in the dDCO.</p>	<p>habitat enhancement measures set out in the Outline LEMP C7.3 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan D [EX4/C7.3_E] and therefore significant weight can be attributed in the planning balance to the benefits of such measures.</p>
2.1.11	Applicant	<p>Requirement 12 (Archaeology)</p> <p>Please comment on LCC's proposed amendments to Requirement 12 as set out in its Written Summary of Oral Submissions made at the ISH5 [REP3-050] (see paragraph 31).</p>	<p>The Applicant does not propose to adopt the draft Requirement 12 included within LCC's submission [REP3-050] as the Applicant's preference is for the WSI to be in an approved form now rather than requiring further approval from the relevant planning authority to ensure the Scheme can be delivered on time and without impediment.</p> <p>The Applicant has held a without prejudice discussion with LCC on the methodology detailed in the Written Scheme of</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Investigation (WSI) [EX4/C6.3.13.7_A] and is revising the WSI on a without prejudice basis for LCC to consider.</p> <p>The WSI proposed by the Applicant is a detailed methodology for the investigation and management of archaeological finds within the Order limits, having full regard to historic environment records and surveys and assessments of the Order limits. The WSI is a detailed document as opposed to an outline management plan that will need to be updated during the detailed design of the Scheme. There is therefore no reason for approval of the WSI to be delayed until after the DCO has been granted.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that it would be unusual for Historic England to comment on archaeological WSIs produced to mitigate impacts on non-designated heritage assets as part of the planning process, and where there is no potential for direct impacts on any designated heritage assets. Historic England's remit is focused on designated heritage assets as detailed by the Historic England Proposals for Development Management. This is reflected in Historic England Advice Note 7 (Second Edition), at Paragraph 27, which states:</p> <p><i>"Non-designated heritage assets may also be identified by the local planning authority during the decision-making process on planning applications, as evidence emerges. Any such decisions to identify non-designated assets need to be made in a way that is consistent with the identification of non-</i></p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p><i>designated heritage assets for inclusion in a local heritage list, properly recorded, and made publicly available, for instance through an addition to a local heritage list, and through recording in the Historic Environment Record (HER)."</i></p> <p>Therefore, the Applicant questions LCC's proposal to consult with Historic England on the approval of the WSI. The Applicant believes that LCC is sufficiently able to oversee the works required to mitigate any potential impacts to non-designated heritage assets through the implementation of the WSI.</p> <p>Paragraphs (3) and (4) of the proposal constitute standard archaeological conditions and the Applicant believes that the WSI [EX4/C6.3.13.7_A] achieves these requirements. The Applicant is looking forward to receiving comments on the content of the WSI, and notes that if further requirements are needed, it would be most appropriate to update the WSI.</p>
2.1.12	LCC	<p>Requirement 21 (Decommissioning and Restoration)</p> <p>The Applicant amended requirement 21 at Deadline 3 to provide greater clarity on the timing for submission of the decommissioning plan in response to matters raised by LCC at ISH5. Please confirm whether or not this</p>	

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		addresses the concerns raised by LCC at ISH5 on this point.	
2.1.13	WLDC	<p>Requirement 21 (Decommissioning and Restoration)</p> <p>Please explain why WLDC considers Requirement 21 should include a trigger mechanism for decommissioning in the event that the Proposed Development ceases to generate electricity for a period of 12 months. Please provide any suggested wording.</p>	
2.1.14	Applicant	<p>Requirement 21 (Decommissioning and Restoration)</p> <p>Please comment on WLDC's suggested trigger mechanisms (as set out in its Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH5 [REP3-057]).</p>	<p>The definition of "date of decommissioning" in the draft Development Consent Order [EX4/C3.1] is <i>"the date that that part of the authorised development has permanently ceased to generate electricity on a commercial basis"</i>. Requirement 21 of the draft DCO requires the Applicant to notify the relevant planning authority 12 months prior to the intended date of decommissioning and submit the decommissioning plan for approval no later than 10 weeks prior to the intended date of decommissioning. The decommissioning plan must be complied with.</p> <p>Failure to comply with a DCO requirement, or a plan secured by a DCO requirement, is an offence and compliance can be enforced under the Planning Act 2008.</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>The Applicant does not consider it to be necessary or appropriate to impose a time limit of 12 months as there could be a wide range of reasons (including those beyond the Applicant's control) that could result in a temporary period where part of the authorised development is required to cease generating with generation then recommencing.</p> <p>The ongoing maintenance of the Scheme is secured by Requirement 14 of the draft Development Consent Order [EN010133/EX4/C3.1_F] through the C7.16 outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [REP3-022], including regular inspections and replacement of equipment as necessary. This will ensure that the Scheme is maintained until it is decommissioned.</p>
2.1.15	Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	<p>Schedule 9 (Deemed Marine Licence)</p> <p>The MMO's attention is drawn to the Applicant's update on the Deemed Marine Licence (DML) at ISH5 (See [REP3-038]) where it was explained that the inclusion of the DML was to safeguard against the risk of an existing exemption falling away. The ExA notes that it is the MMO's intention to provide a full response at Deadline 3A. notwithstanding the MMO's position that a DML may not be</p>	

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		required, please include comments on the DML (including any comments on conditions) on a without prejudice basis.	
2.1.16	All parties with protective provisions for their benefit included in Schedule	Schedule 16 - (PPs) Please provide an update on discussions regarding PPs, identifying any outstanding areas of disagreement/proposed alternative wording.	
2.1.17	Applicant	Schedule 17 (Procedure for discharge of requirements) The ExA notes WLDC's objection to the deemed consent provisions set out in Schedule 17 (See WLDC's Written Summary of Oral Submissions for ISH5 [REP3-057]. The Applicant is asked to respond to WLDC's proposed timescales.	The Applicant notes that WLDC objects to the inclusion of a deemed consent provision. If WLDC has concerns about an application for approval submitted under Schedule 17 to the draft Development Consent Order [EX3/C3.1], then it can either refuse the application or request further information. The deemed approval process is designed to prevent the Scheme being delayed where WLDC fails to take any action. A deemed approval in such circumstances is considered proportionate and necessary for a nationally significant infrastructure project with a fixed grid connection date. It is noted that a deemed refusal applies under paragraph 2(5) of Schedule 17 where the application is likely to give rise to any materially new or different environmental effects.

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			Approval timescales have been extended to address concerns raised by WLDC. These have been extended to 10 weeks as per the other solar projects in this area and this is considered to be proportionate to balance the competing needs of WLDC and the Scheme.
2.1.18	Applicant	Schedule 17 (Procedure for discharge of requirements) Please comment on LCC's suggested wording for Schedule 17(5) (as set out in paragraph 34 of its Written Summary of Oral Submissions made at the ISH5 [REP3-050]).	The Applicant recognises that the Scheme may present a greater administrative burden for the discharge of Requirements than a typical application to discharge a planning condition. The Applicant has therefore updated Schedule 17, Paragraph 5 to include revised drafting on fees proposed by LCC. The Applicant understands that this drafting is also acceptable to WLDC.
2.1.19	Host Authorities	Please provide full details of any outstanding drafting points previously raised which are still a matter of dispute between the Applicant and the respective Host Authorities. Where alternative wording is proposed by the Host Authorities this should be provided.	
2.1.20	All parties	The ExA notes that a number of amendments were made to the dDCO at Deadline 3 to address drafting points raised by interested parties at previous deadlines or hearings. All	

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		interested parties are invited to submit details of any drafting points previously raised that they consider have not been addressed by the Applicant to date.	

3 General and cross-topic matters

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.2.1	Applicant/Host Authorities	The ExA notes that the SoCGs with the Host Authorities indicate a number of matters are still under discussion. These include a number of factual matters eg site description. The ExA considers that it should be possible for many of these matters to be agreed at this point in the Examination. Please provide updated SoCGs at Deadline 4 which clearly identifies the outstanding matters in dispute between the Applicant and each Host Authority and provides details of each party's position in respect of them.	An updated Statement of Common Ground with Lincolnshire County Council [EN010133/EX4/C8.3.2_C] has been provided for Deadline 4. West Lindsey Council has also now provided comments and queries on the SoCG between the parties which the applicant is in the process of reviewing and responding to as detailed within the Statement of Commonality [EN010133/EX4/C8.1.9_C]. An updated SoCG with West Lindsey will be provided on or before Deadline 5.
2.2.2	All Parties	The Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in December 2023. Comments are invited	Footnote 62 of the NPPF states that " <i>The availability of agricultural land used for food production should be considered,</i>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>from all parties on its implications for the consideration of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p><i>alongside the other policies in this Framework, when deciding what sites are most appropriate for development”.</i></p> <p>Footnote 62 of the NPPF should be read in the context of NPS EN-3 (November 2023) which recognises that solar farms may be located on agricultural land where necessary (Paragraph 2.10.29).</p> <p>As set out in C6.3.5.1 ES Appendix 5.1 Site Selection Assessment [APP-067], selection of the Site accounted for agricultural land classification. Paragraph 3.3.22 states that the Scheme maximises the utilisation of low grade, non best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land with 95.9% of the land being classified as non BMV land. The land required for the Scheme has been demonstrated within C6.3.5.1 ES Appendix 5.1 Site Selection Assessment [APP-067] to perform better than 8 of the assessed Potential Development Areas (PDAs) and equal to the remaining one following the site selection process. Consequently, it has been concluded that there are no obviously more suitable locations for the Scheme within the Search Area.</p> <p>The Applicant has no further additional comments to add regarding the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2023 beyond what has already been stated in section 5.5 of the Planning Statement [EN010133/EX4/C7.5_C]. The Applicant considers that the changes do not change the compliance of the Scheme with the</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			NPPF as assessed in the Planning Statement [EN010133/EX4/C7.5_C] .
2.2.3	West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) /Applicant	WDLC in its response to ExQ1.2.3 [REP2-076] has referred to a 'health' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Please provide a copy of this SPD and identify relevant passages. The Applicant's comments are also sought on this.	The "Health Impact Assessment for Planning Applications: Guidance Note" April 2023, is primarily to support policy S54 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2023) which states the requirements for a Health Impact Assessment for any development over 5 ha in area. Whilst the Applicant understands the Scheme is able to beneficially contribute towards the general themes of health and wellbeing the policy is written to achieve, this policy has not been considered by the Applicant as the policy is aimed almost entirely at TCPA planning applications and requirements at that scale. As the Scheme is an NSIP, the scoping for a HIA is to be determined by PINS. In the EIA Scoping Opinion [APP-064], the Applicant's approach to assessing health and wellbeing impacts was agreed with no requirement made for a separate HIA to be undertaken.
2.2.4	Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC)/Applicant	NCC, in its response to ExQ1.2.5 [REP2-075], has referred to Policy WCS2, which does not appear to have been identified at paragraph 2.68 in its Local Impact Report [REP-086]. Please provide a copy of the policy wording. The Applicant's comments are also sought on Policy WCS2.	The Applicant confirms that they consider Policy WCS2 of the Nottinghamshire Waste Core Strategy (2013) is relevant to the Scheme and has updated the assessment of policies accordance in Appendix 4 of Planning Statement [EN010133/EX4/C7.5_C] for Deadline 4. The Applicant is confident that the Scheme is in compliance with the requirements of Policy WCS2, as a result of its commitments to consideration of the Waste Hierarchy, relevant industry guidance, and the waste management and mitigation

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>strategies set out in Section 20.6 and 20.8 of C6.2.20 ES Chapter 20: Waste [APP-055] and the relevant sections of the outline CEMP [REP3-012], outline OEMP [EN0101033/EX4/C7.16_C], and Decommissioning Statement [REP3-014]. These outline documents are secured by Requirements 13, 14, and 21 of Schedule 2 to C3.1_F Draft Development Consent Order Revision F [EN010133/EX4/C3.1_F].</p>
2.2.5	Applicant	<p>Please explain whether, and if so how, the Applicant has taken into account the Local Industrial Strategy 2021 (as referred to by 7000 acres in its response to ExQ1.2.9 [REP2-094]) (and signpost where this information can be found in the application documents)).</p>	<p>The Greater Lincolnshire Local Enterprise Partnership's Local Industrial Strategy (2021) is supported by the LEP's Economic Plan for Growth (2021), of the latter of which have been considered in C6.2.18 ES Chapter 18_Socio Economics Tourism and Recreation [APP-053]. These considerations have input into the qualitative aspects of determination of the sensitivity of key economic sectors (such as agri-food, energy, and visitor economy) in the assessment areas. The LIS is a strategic document rather than a policy document, and as such, it has been considered generally rather than through express reference to strategic aims in the document.</p> <p>The Applicant is confident that the Scheme does not undermine any part of the LIS, and will continue to ensure that the LIS and any relevant updates to it are considered in full for the drafting of the detailed Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan pursuant to Requirements 20 of Schedule 2 to C3.1_F Draft Development Consent Order Revision F [EN010133/EX4/C3.1_F].</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>C7.5_C Planning Statement Revision C [EN010133/EX4/C7.5_C] sets out at Appendix 4 how the Scheme is consistent with meeting the overall spatial strategy for employment set out in Policy S28. This policy references the Local Industrial Strategy. As such, the Applicant considers that the Scheme is consistent with the strategic intentions of local planning policy.</p>
2.2.6	Applicant	Please explain whether the continuing use of solar panels and batteries after their average lifespan of 40 years is likely to result in an increased failure rate. If so, please explain how this has been taken into account in the assessments presented in the ES.	<p>Please refer to C8.2.7 Review of Likely Significant Effects at 60 Years [REP2-058] for consideration of the changes to the findings of significant effects from considering a potential operational lifespan of the Scheme for up to 60 years. The Applicant confirms that the assessment methodology underpinning this document is as set out in Chapter 2: EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037] and, where applicable, in each chapter of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>There is currently no data available as to the failure rate of equivalent solar panels after 40 years. The parameters assessed in C8.2.7 Review of Likely Significant Effects at 60 Years [REP2-058] assume that a 0.4% per year replacement rate for panels continues between years 40 and 60 and that any effects would not be significant and can be adequately managed through the OEMP. In the event that a greater replacement rate was required due to an increased failure rate then the Applicant would need to demonstrate that such a replacement rate would not give rise to any new or materially different environmental effects compared to those assessed in</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>the Environmental Statement or make an application to amend the DCO. Alternatively, the Applicant may decide to decommission that part of the Scheme at that point in time. The replacement rate is the rate at which panels would be replaced should they cease to operate entirely. Separately, panel performance across the Scheme would gradually degrade over a number of years, but this has been accounted for within the models of the Scheme's viability and production estimates and this would not be a reason in itself for large-scale panel replacement within the lifetime of the Scheme.</p> <p>The C8.2.7 Review of Likely Significant Effects at 60 Years [REP2-058] concludes that replacing the BESS for a second time between the years 40 to 60 (if required) is unlikely to give rise to likely significant GHG emissions..</p> <p>The BESS will operate in line with manufacturers guidelines and the data analytics integrated into the Battery Management Systems will ensure that modules are decommissioned if operational performance is not within recommended parameters.</p>
2.2.7	7000 Acres	Why does 7000 Acres consider that the Proposed Development would undermine the Local Industrial Strategy (2021) as is set out in its response to ExQ1.2.9 [REP2-094]?	

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.2.8	Applicant	Does the Applicant intend the Review of Likely Significant Effects at 60 Years [REP2-058] to be a certified document – as it is unclear whether or not it forms part of the ES.	The conclusions of the Review of Likely Significant Effects at 60 Years [REP2-058] have been added to the updated Chapter 23 of the ES. However, the Applicant has amended Schedule 14 to the draft DCO to make it clear that both documents form part of the ES and are certified documents.
2.2.9	Applicant	In response to ExQ1.2.22 [REP2-034], the Applicant explains that significant effects are those considered after mitigation measures have been implemented. Whilst the ExA understands this, the Applicant is asked to explain the reasons why mitigation measures were not considered for these significant adverse effects.	The Applicant has followed the methodology as set out in Chapter 2 of the ES [APP-037]. This sets out the mitigation principles and process. This will be further detailed in each relevant ES topic chapter and explains how any additional mitigation will be secured (either via a specific DCO requirement or via a management strategy, plan, or document secured by a DCO requirement).
2.2.10	Applicant	The ExA notes that the Concept Design Parameters and Principles document [REP3-020] was updated at Deadline 3. Please provide further explanation on the amendments made in relation to the scale of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS).	The amendments made by the Applicant clarified the maximum dimensions of a BESS enclosure (53-foot ISO container) which would be permitted for the scheme. This is to allow a full range of BESS enclosure designs to be considered at the detailed design stage. Previous dimensions were based upon a relatively small-scale BESS cabinet design which could be obsolete within a relatively short time frame. More detail was also added to fire suppression system design concepts after discussion with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service to reflect the latest BESS system fire protection designs.

4 The need case, electricity generated and climate change

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.3.1	All interested parties	<p>On 22 November 2023, the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero published an updated version of the draft National Policy Statements (NPS) for Energy (EN-1 to EN-5) which contain some changes to elements regarding the decision-making process for low carbon generation applications in general including solar generating stations and related connections. These revised draft Statements have also been laid before Parliament but are not yet designated for the purposes of s104 of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Do any parties have any comments on the potential effect of changes in the November 2023 versions of the revised draft Energy NPS on matters related to this application, compared to the March 2023 versions of the Energy National Policy Statements?</p>	<p>The November 2023 Energy National Policy Statements (NPSs) were formally designated on 17 January 2024. The Planning Statement [EN010133/EX4/C7.5_C] has been revised to align with the latest national policy position. Appendix 3 of the Planning Statement [EN010133/EX4/C7.5_C] sets out the modifications to the November 2023 NPSs and outlines the Scheme's compliance to these revisions.</p> <p>In NPS EN-1 (November 2023), government concludes that national energy security and net zero ambitions will only be delivered through the development of new low carbon sources of energy at speed and scale (Para 4.2.2) and therefore that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure (Para 4.2.4). Low carbon electricity generation infrastructure is described as <i>"all onshore and offshore generation that does not involve fossil fuel combustion"</i> (Para 4.2.5) and as such large-scale solar generation would be classified as CNP infrastructure under NPS EN-1 (November 2023).</p> <p>Government expects that <i>"For projects which qualify as CNP Infrastructure, it is likely that the need case will outweigh the residual effects in all but the most exceptional cases"</i> (Para 4.1.7)</p> <p>The designation of large-scale solar as Critical National Priority infrastructure supports the Applicant's case for the significant weight which it considers should be applied to the planning balance when considering the Scheme.</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.3.2	Applicant	Action Point 2 of the Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submissions and Responses at ISH5 [REP3-038] states that a panel failure rate of 0.4% has been applied "in line with industry standards" to the climate change assessment of operational impacts from panel failure/replacement. Table 1.1 of the 'Review of Likely Significant Effects at 60 Years: Environmental Statement Review' [REP2-058] states that over a 60-year operational lifespan 24% of the panels would be replaced. However, the Applicant states [REP2-048] that solar panels have an "average lifespan of 40 years" suggesting a 100% replacement rate at 40 years. Can the Applicant explain this discrepancy?	Please see the Applicant's response to question 2.2.6 above. The Applicant has referred to an "average lifespan of 40 years" but there is currently no data available for panels of this type that have been operating for more than 40 years. Panel performance across the Scheme would gradually degrade over a number of years, but the rate of this degradation in 40 years' time is not known. The Applicant's position is that it should not be required to automatically decommission the whole of the Scheme at 40 years if it is still capable of generating electricity. Any replacement of panels will need to be within the parameters assessed in the Environmental Statement.

5 Other projects and cumulative effects

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.4.1	Applicant	The ExA notes the Applicant's post hearing note at ISH4 [REP3-035] in respect of the scoping report for the Stow Park solar	No cultural heritage-based cumulative effects have been identified as a result of the Scheme and the Stow Park solar project. Therefore, no change has been identified that affects the Applicant's conclusions on the assessment of cumulative effects

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		project. Please provide an update including whether this new information affects the Applicant's conclusions on the assessment of cumulative effects.	with consideration to new information associated to the Stow Park solar project. Please refer to Technical Note on Cumulative Effects [EN010133/EX4/C8.2.12]
2.4.2	Applicant	<p>At ISH4, the Applicant stated that it did not intend to update changes to cumulative impacts in individual aspect chapters, instead preferring to update the Joint Report on Interrelationships with other NSIPs [REP3-027]. Please confirm whether it is the Applicant's intention that the Joint Report will be a certified document?</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the ExA considers that where there are changes to the conclusions reached in the individual aspect chapters of the ES, it is the ES that should be updated and not the Joint Report. The Applicant should ensure that, where necessary, all chapters of the ES contain full and up-to-date information on cumulative effects and where information is contained in other documents that informs the assessment, this should be appropriately cross referenced in the Chapter.</p>	<p>In light of the questions raised by the Examining Authority, the Applicant is proposing to submit a Cumulative Effects Addendum at Deadline 5 which will form part of the ES and provide a more detailed explanation of the reviews undertaken since the submission of the DCO Application and any changes made to Chapter 23. The Cumulative Effects Addendum will include the information contained in the latest version of the Joint Report on Interrelationships with other NSIPs and the information in Technical Note on Cumulative Effects [EN010133/EX4/C8.2.12].</p> <p>The Applicant considers that it would be unusual and disproportionate to have to update the text in all of the ES Chapters and their associated appendices to account for any changes that have taken places since the DCO Application was submitted as this would result in a rewrite of the entire ES.</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.4.3	Applicant	<p>Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity of the ES [APP-044] identifies at paragraph 9.9.9 that a minor cumulative adverse effect operating at a Local or District scale may be caused to harvest mouse. Chapter 9 does not set out 'significant' effects but rather depends on an alternative methodology from CIEEM guidance based on Important Ecological Features, which above negligible includes effects at a Local and District Scale.</p> <p>In its response to ExQ1.6.12, the Applicant confirmed that an addendum to ES Chapter 9 will be produced to include the significance of the cumulative ecological effects in line with those set out in the Joint Report on Interrelationships with other NSIPs [REP3-027]. Please can the Applicant provide this for Deadline 4 or provide details of when it expects to submit this document into the Examination. Please can the applicant also explain why the effect on harvest mouse not included in the Joint Report on Interrelationships, Appendix E [REP3-027] and how the methodology that the Joint Report on Interrelationships with other</p>	<p>The addendum document to Chapter 9 will be submitted for Deadline 4.</p> <p>In paragraph 9.9.9 of Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-044], a <i>potential</i> cumulative impact on harvest mice is identified, which depended on the degree of habitat retention and suitable grassland creation within the three nearby schemes which was not known at the time of preparation. Subsequently, the Joint Report on Interrelationships was prepared following further design and habitat management information from these schemes which confirmed that grassland habitat buffers and habitat creation would take place. Consequently, it was not assessed that the cumulative impact on harvest mice would arise and so was not included. The methodology followed to assess cumulative effects in the Joint Report on Interrelationships is the same as that followed in Chapter 9 of the ES, as set out in the CIEEM Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment.</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		NSIPs [REP3-027] uses to identify significant effects relates to that in Chapter 9.	
2.4.4	Applicant	The ExA notes the additional information provided in Appendix E of the Joint Report on Interrelationships with other NSIPs [REP3-027] in respect of the professional judgements made on the cumulative effect on climate change. Please explain why the Applicant considers it is possible to assess cumulative effects on Climate Change given the national rather than local scale of the impact.	<p>We are aware of the scale of challenge of preparing a cumulative impact assessment on climate change for all proposed NSIP developments. Each scheme has concluded significant beneficial cumulative impacts for the respective scheme in isolation.</p> <p>For Cottam/West Burton, a cumulative beneficial cumulative effect has been identified as four solar projects being developed at the same time would result in a quicker reduction in CO₂e emissions from legacy sources than a single project alone.</p> <p>This approach takes into account professional judgment and interpretation of the IEMA Guidance.</p> <p>A more conservative approach has been taken by Gate Burton and Tillbridge and no additional cumulative beneficial effects have been identified as a result of their interpretation of the Guidance. That interpretation considers that 'cumulative effects' are not possible to assess for climate change given the national, rather than local, scale of the impact.</p> <p>In light of this difference in interpretation, the SoS may decide to place limited weight on the beneficial cumulative effects identified by the Applicant (albeit, each Scheme has identified beneficial effects for each Scheme, assessed individually).</p> <p>Discussion between the different authors of the Climate Change</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			Assessments for the projects has taken place to under that the approach taken in each environmental statement.

6 Landscape and visual, glint and glare, good design

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.5.1	Applicant/LCC	Please provide an update on the outcome of the meeting between the Applicant's landscape consultants and LCC which was due to take place in early January 2024.	<p>The meeting was held on 4th January 2024 with the Applicant's landscape consultants and LCC (Neil McBride Head of Planning and Oliver Brown AAH Planning Consultants) in attendance. Prior to the meeting AAH prepared a draft briefing note that formed the basis for discussion. The meeting also focussed on the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) to be agreed between the Applicant and LCC [EN010133/EX4/C8.3.2_C]. The Applicant set out their position with regard to beneficial effects which showed that although significant beneficial effects had been assessed for each of the Sites in isolation, when assessed in combination, there are no significant beneficial effects identified for the Scheme as a whole. AAH confirmed at the meeting that in the context of there being no significant beneficial effects as a whole they would need to re-evaluate their views as to whether they consider the findings between LCC and the Applicant to be more closely aligned.</p> <p>A further meeting was convened for Monday 15th January 2024. Prior to this meeting the Applicant issued a draft Joint Statement regarding the weighting of the significance of the positive</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>impacts of mitigation on landscape character that formed a basis for discussion. This draft Joint Statement sets out the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where matters and conclusions of significant beneficial effects are agreed 2. Where there are differences in agreement over significant beneficial effect conclusions 3. Reasons for the differences in agreement over opinion regarding the findings of significant beneficial landscape effects. <p>Following the meeting on the 15th January 2024, AAH agreed to provide comments to the Applicant on the draft Joint Statement by Monday 22nd January 2024. The Joint Statement has been submitted at Deadline 4, which is Appended to the SOCG [EN010133/EX4/C8.3.2_C].</p>
2.5.2	Applicant	<p>NPS EN-5 is concerned with the long-distance transmission system (400kV and 275kV lines) and the lower voltage distribution system (132kV to 230v lines from transmission substations to the end-user); and associated infrastructure, for example substations and converter stations that facilitate the conversion between direct and alternating current. Please explain the relevance of NPS EN-5 in so far as it relates to the Applicant's conclusion of beneficial landscape effects as highlighted in paragraphs 2.8.3 and</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.8.2 of NPS EN-5 (2011) states that the NPS EN-5 will be relevant to electricity infrastructure if it constitutes associated development for an NSIP such as a generating station.</p> <p>The Applicant is not suggesting that there is a reconfiguration or rationalising of the existing energy infrastructure as a result of the Scheme. However, the Applicant does consider that it is relevant that NPS EN-5 recognises that positive landscape and visual benefits can arise (paragraph 2.8.3) and lists various types of appropriate mitigation that can have a softening effect (paragraph 2.8.11).</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		2.8.11 in Appendix 1 of [REP3-033]). For example, is the Applicant suggesting that there is a reconfiguration or rationalising of existing electricity infrastructure?	
2.5.3	Applicant	Given the scale of the Proposed Development, please explain (with reasons) whether the Applicant considers the introduction of a significant number of solar panels and other associated infrastructure would become a defining feature of the landscape once operational (eg at year 1 and year 15).	<p>The introduction of a significant number of solar panels and other associated infrastructure would not become a defining feature on the landscape once operational (e.g. at year 1 and year 15). The six primary reasons are set out below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dispersed nature of the Sites: The dispersed nature of the Sites will assist with assimilation. The low-lying areas between the separate Sites are effective as visual buffers on a horizontal plane. This likely helps in reducing the visual impacts of the panels. 2. Nature of Scheme being 'overlaid' and reversible: For example, developments for mineral extraction fundamentally change the nature of the landscape in which they operate, whereas solar projects, with the exception of the footprint of the buildings, are 'overlaid' on the landscape. This allows the important landscape features such as hedgerows, trees and watercourses to remain. 3. Strong framework of existing vegetation: The strong framework of existing vegetation means that this will provide the structure for the Scheme to be set comfortably and not become intrusive. This will be evident at year 1 when the existing hedgerows will have

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>grown out to allow the Scheme to remain low-level. The intermediary areas between the separate Sites boast a strong network of existing vegetation providing structural benefits to the landscape. The existing vegetation also acts as a backdrop for the panels and helps them integrate, particularly in views towards the horizon. By contrast, some areas between the separate Sites provide open character.</p> <p>4. The benefits of mitigation: Year 15 would bring forward the benefits of the new planting in reducing the adverse effects. Please refer to the LVIA [REP2-008] specifically Table 8.21 which sets out the strategic approach to the landscape design parameters that have been adopted in the process of developing the environmental masterplan and associated landscape mitigation measures. These measures are particularly suited to a series of separate sites and are also beneficial for the features of importance. For example, the watercourses are noted as distinct features in the landscape, and careful use of scattered tree and shrub planting helps reinforce their presence in a generous open context while setting panels back.</p> <p>5. Biodiversity Net Gain: In following the mitigation hierarchy, the Scheme will deliver significant areas of mitigation that will enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity. This will deliver additional enhancement and connections to wider</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>ecological networks as well as contributing to the enhancement of the quality of the landscape going well beyond biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>6. Defining legacy: The defining legacy of the landscape would be the robust framework of features that have improved through the mitigation and landscape enhancements. This mitigation in turn would give rise to long-term wider benefits, including maintaining and enhancing biodiversity and in promoting the resilience of ecosystems. A key policy objective is the incorporation of new planting and green infrastructure in all landscape mitigation measures. The receiving landscape is designed to allow space for such green infrastructure between areas. Public rights of way are also buffered, maintaining accessibility while minimising the impact of the panels along these routes for the long-term. The areas between the Sites also provide scope for extended enjoyment of the landscape in these areas either through interpretation, access or exponentially. The time depth within the landscape involves considering historical and cultural aspects such as the setting of settlements and the views of churches. The receiving landscape between the Sites provides scope to preserve and enhance the time depth.</p>
2.5.4	Applicant	The ExA notes that the Applicant has concluded the visual effect on residential	The visual effects on the residential receptor at North Farm (R63A) are concluded to be significant, being moderate-major

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>receptor R63A (North Farm) would be significant during construction and at year 1 of operation, reducing to minor/moderate (not significant) at year 15 of operation. Can the Applicant provide details of when it considers the mitigation will become effective (ie for how long does the Applicant consider the receptor would experience significant effects).</p>	<p>adverse, at construction and year 1 of operation, reducing to minor-moderate adverse at year 15. The details of when the mitigation will become effective are set out below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mitigation: The implementation of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Revision E (the 'OLEMP') [EX4/C7.3_E] sets out at section 4.12, how the Scheme will introduce changes to the existing hedgerows by allowing them to grow out and reach a height of 5m within 1-2 years, at which point they will have begun to provide screening of the panels. The introduction of new hedgerows will provide screening of the panels within 5 years and intermittent trees will also provide softening to the skyline within 5 years. The OLEMP sets out this commitment, at section 4.12, relating to how the implementation of this mitigation will be secured in advance of the commencement of the construction of the Scheme. 2. The detailed assessment for North Farm concludes that the visibility of the panels is mainly focussed from first floor windows of the main farmhouse to the south overlooking Willingham Road. To the south, the panels are offset by at least 240m within a landscape that supports a good network of hedgerows and tree cover, which assist with their integration. Visibility to the north towards the panels is curtailed by existing woodland and

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			to east, the panels are distanced at 870m, with the panels distanced at approximately 380m to the west.

7 Biodiversity and the Habitats Regulations Assessment

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.6.1	Natural England	Natural England's views are sought on the Revised Information to Support a Habitat Regulations Assessment document [REP3-024], which has been updated to include the Humber Estuary Ramsar site.	
2.6.2	Applicant	Further to the Applicant's response to ExQ1.6.10 [REP2-034] in relation to why the significance of effects for decommissioning are not listed, how would decommissioning effects then be considered and assessed considering the ES should assess the worst case scenario for all stages of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant's position is that as a reasonable worst-case the effects at decommissioning would be the same as during the construction phase. However, the Applicant acknowledges that it is difficult to know what statutory conservation legislation will be in effect at that point in the future and there is therefore the potential for the significance of effects to increase at decommissioning beyond those identified at construction. For example, if more species become legally protected.
2.6.3	Applicant	The Joint Report on Interrelationships with other NSIPs, Appendix E [REP3-027] indicates there would be a moderate cumulative adverse effect during	It is correct that the predicted cumulative significant residual effect is likely to be felt at a greater geographical scale than identified within Chapter 9 of the ES. No further mitigation is proposed to address this since all available land and

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>construction and operation on skylark, yellow wagtail, grey partridge and quail at a District (rather than to Local to District) level. Please clarify if this adverse effect is over and above that identified in Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity of the ES [APP-044] and, if so, is further mitigation proposed?</p>	<p>opportunities for mitigation through provision of habitat for ground-nesting birds within the Order Limits have been pursued, hence the cumulative effect is described as a residual effect.</p>
2.6.4	Applicant/Natural England	<p>Further to the Applicant's response to ExQ1.6.13 [REP2-034], should the ExA therefore consider BNG to be at least 10% (110+%), rather than other figures that are cited in the application because these other figures also include mitigation and compensation to address impacts.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the agreed SoCG [REP3-047], Natural England's view is also sought on this matter, as the Applicant has referred to DEFRA's 2022 BNG consultation in this regard.</p>	<p>Please see the Applicant's response to question 2.1.9.</p>

8 The water environment

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.7.1	Applicant	With regard to the Applicant's response to ExQ1.7.3 [REP2-034], does the classification of people and property considered to be "More Vulnerable" have regard to those who may reside in basement dwellings, caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use. Interested Parties in Deadline 2 submissions have drawn the ExA's attention to gypsy and traveller sites found in the vicinity of the Order limits. Does this have a bearing in relation to the significance of effects reported?	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that gypsy traveller sites would be classified as 'Highly Vulnerable' within 'Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification' in the National Planning Policy Framework, given the provision within the guidance for 'Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use' which would raise the sensitivity to 'high'.</p> <p>However, the significance of effect will remain 'Major Adverse' as reported within C6.2.10 ES Chapter 10_Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-039].</p> <p>Following the inclusion of the embedded mitigation measures detailed in Section 10.1 of C6.2.10 ES Chapter 10_Hydrology Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045] all risks are considered to be negligible.</p>
2.7.2	Applicant	Further to the Applicant's response to ExQ1.7.7 [REP2-034], the ExA is unclear whether flood storage areas are in fact proposed. Please confirm.	<p>The Applicant confirms that flood storage areas are not proposed as part of the scheme.</p> <p>Where hardstanding areas are proposed surface water attenuation is proposed. The proposed drainage strategy is detailed within Section 5.0 of C6.3.10.1 ES Appendix 10.1 Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report [APP-090].</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.7.3	Applicant	Please provide an update on the intended SoCG with the Scunthorpe and Gainsborough Internal Drainage Board.	A draft Statement of Common Ground with the Scunthorpe and Gainsborough Water Management Board [EX4/C8.3.15] has been submitted at Deadline 4.
2.7.4	Water Management Consortium	In light of the Water Management Consortium's WR [REP-102] and the distance between the Order limits and Toft Dyke near Clayworth and Cuckstool Dyke east of Ossington, Sutton-on-Trent, please provide further explanation for the need to investigate these watercourses.	
2.7.5	Environment Agency/Water Management Consortium	Please confirm whether your organisation is now content with the Applicant's approach to the buffer from watercourses.	
2.7.6	Applicant	Is it the Applicant's intention to register a flood risk activity exemption (FRA3 for any service crossing below the bed of a main river not involving an open cut technique), as has been advised by the EA [REP2-080] at 1.7.1. If not, please explain how the EA's point would be addressed.	The Applicant confirms that a flood risk activity exemption (FRA3), will be applied for any service crossing below the bed of a main river not involving an open cut technique.
2.7.7	Applicant	The Review of Likely Significant Effects at 60 Years document [REP2-058] involves a time period that would exceed that set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)	There is not suitable data available to undertake the requested modelling at this stage. To address this issue, the Applicant has included a requirement in the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 4 to undertake further modelling in the event that the Scheme

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>documents. However, the FRA should assess a worst case scenario and so this would not be addressed by undertaking subsequent modelling and making any consequential alterations sometime in the future, as the document [REP2-058] suggests.</p> <p>Please therefore provide an updated FRA with updated flood modelling and where relevant, any updated mitigation. Any other relevant Chapters should be updated to reflect any changes eg flood risk and climate change.</p>	<p>continues operating beyond 40 years. The Applicant has sent the proposed drafting to the EA for comment.</p>
2.7.8	Applicant	<p>Further to the Applicant's response to ExQ1.7.19 [REP2-034], if the Applicant is relying on the site owner(s) to bear responsibility for the robust maintenance of drainage, how will this be secured and have the owners been made aware of these responsibilities?</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that all landowners have legal riparian responsibilities for drains located on their properties. The Applicant is not suggesting that landowners need to undertake any additional works or responsibilities than they are already subject to. The Applicant will be responsible for the maintenance of any drains located within the solar arrays under the terms of the voluntary property agreements during the operation of the Scheme.</p>
2.7.9	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 6.10.40 of the revised Planning Statement [REP2-028] states in relation to drainage that vehicles should be fitted with low pressure tyres to further reduce the impact on the underlying soil. How</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.1.1 of the C6.3.19.2_B Outline Soil Management Plan [REP3-010] sets out general principles to be included within the soil management plan including "use low ground pressure (LGP models) and tracked vehicles where possible when working directly on bare or vegetated soils to minimise the extent and/or</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		would this be secured and in relation to what type of vehicles?	intensity of the soil loosening/decompaction required after reinstatement".
2.7.10	Applicant	Please provide an update in relation to water quality matters, which is understood will be the subject of a SoCG with the Environment Agency, concerning a Water Management Plan.	As detailed in C8.3.8 Environment Agency Statement of Common Ground (Draft) [EN010133/EX4/C8.3.8_A] at HY-004 & HY-011, a Water Management Plan will form part of a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) secured by Requirement 13 in Schedule 2 of C3.1_F Draft Development Consent Order Revision F [EN010133/EX4/C3.1_F] .
2.7.11	Applicant	In response to ExQ1.7.11 [REP2-034] the Applicant states that "there is no difference in requirements for either flood zone for this type of scheme". However, where essential infrastructure is located in Flood Zone 3b (functional floodplain) there are additional considerations for the Exception Test, namely that development should be designed and constructed to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; • result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and • not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere. 	The Applicant is in the process of liaising with both Lincolnshire Lead Local Flood Authority and Nottinghamshire Lead Local Flood Authority to confirm the delimitation of Flood Zone 3b in the Scheme area. Notwithstanding the delineation as detailed within Section 6.0 Sequential and Exception Test within C6.3.10.1 ES Appendix 10.1 Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report [APP-090], the proposed scheme will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remain operational and safe for users in times of flood; • result in no net loss of floodplain storage; and • not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		In line with the above, the Applicant is asked to clarify whether the Proposed Development site is located within Flood Zone 3b and, if so, whether the above considerations of the Exception Test have been met. Whilst the ExA recognises that EA mapping does not differentiate between Flood Zones 3a and 3b, the Applicant should liaise with the Lead Local Flood Authority to determinate the location of the Proposed Development in relation to the functional floodplain.	

9 Soils and agriculture

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.8.1	Applicant	Has the cable route corridor been surveyed since the response to ExQ1 and when will this information be before the examination, as regards the depth where the cables would be found, and in relation to soil management and field drainage?	A soil survey of the Cable Route Corridor (including an ALC assessment) will be undertaken post consent and prior to the commencement of construction. Undertaking the survey at this time, once the detailed design has been confirmed, will allow the survey to be confined to the actual land to be excavated rather than the entirety of the Cable Route Corridor.
2.8.2	Applicant	How would damage to the field drainage be avoided?	Where any field drains are encountered by the Cable Route Corridor trench, these will be cut to enable the cable to be laid below their depth, then reconnected with a new section of drain

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			before the trench is backfilled over the drain. Farmers will be questioned regarding presence and orientation of drains, and the specification of the drain itself so that appropriate field drain pipe sections will be on hand.
2.8.3	Applicant	Can the Applicant provide some details of the farming circumstances along the cable route corridor?	<p>As noted at paragraph 19.3.7 of the ES Chapter 19 Soils and Agriculture [REP-010], the cable route corridor has not been subject to soil surveys or farming circumstances assessment as the narrow cable trench will need a specific survey along its actual path to inform soil management planning of the trenching works. Detailed ALC survey of fields places sample points at 100m intervals, too widely spaced to monitor soil variation within the soil to be excavated for the trench.</p> <p>Farming circumstances information for the Cable Route Corridor will be obtained post consent. This will include greater detail on current land use, for instance the actual cropping of land at the time of the cable trenching work rather than a typical arable rotation across a farm's arable land. This will enable an assessment of particularly sensitive periods of time for trenching work to seek to avoid, for instance target harvest dates.</p> <p>Compensation will be paid to landowners for any loss or damage, for example crop damage, if it is not practicable to avoid sensitive periods of time.</p>
2.8.4	Applicant	The ExA notes the Applicant's explanation as to why the IEMA threshold of 20 hectares has not been applied.	The IEMA threshold of 20ha for BMV land is given on Table 19.4 and described in paragraph 19.7.7 of ES Chapter 19 Soils and Agriculture [REP-010] . This IEMA threshold is for the

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		Please explain whether, and if so how, the application of the 20 hectares threshold would alter the conclusions of ES Chapter 19: Agriculture and Soils [REP-010] in so far as it relates to the loss of agricultural land resource.	permanent loss of 20ha of BMV agricultural land. As the Scheme will be decommissioned no later than 60 years following the date of final commissioning and the vast majority of the Site can remain in agricultural production throughout the operational period, loss of agricultural land is not permanent. There is therefore no change to the assessment of environmental effects if the IEMA 20ha threshold was applied.
2.8.5	Applicant	The Review of Likely Significant Effects at 60 Years document [REP2-058] sets out that soil resources will benefit from the longer fallow period. Please explain how this extended time period would affect agricultural productivity given that the Applicant is not relying on the land remaining in agricultural use during the operational period?	<p>Agricultural productivity is often described in economic terms as the value of a tonne dry matter of one crop is not equivalent to that of another crop, or even the same crop in a different year.</p> <p>The economic value of hosting Solar PV (i.e. the income received for the lease of land) is anticipated to exceed that of rotations of combinable crops such as wheat, barley and oil seed. Any farm income from grazing sheep within the solar farm will be in addition.</p>
2.8.6	Natural England	The Applicant has submitted a further version of the Outline Soil Management Plan [REP3-010] at Deadline 3. The ExA seeks Natural England's views, in light of comments made on previous version(s) of this document.	
2.8.7	Applicant	Please explain why cumulative effects on soils and agriculture is not included in Appendix E of the Joint Report on Interrelationships with other NSIPs [REP3-	For the Gate Burton Energy Park DCO submission, soils and agriculture are assessed within ES Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [EN010131/APP-021]. The assessment of cumulative effects provided in the Joint Report on

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		027]. The ExA also notes that paragraphs 19.11.3 and 4 of the revised ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [REP-010] still sets out there is an absence of such assessment results in the public domain and no meaningful data is available to appraise farming circumstances for these six cumulative sites, even though a number of these schemes have now progressed.	Interrelationships [EN010133/EX4/C8.1.8_C] follows this approach. The wording of the December 2023 update for Socio-Economics in the version submitted at Deadline 4 clarifies that soils and agriculture have been assessed. The Technical Note on Cumulative Effects [EN010133/EX4/C8.2.12] provides a separate assessment for soils and agriculture.
2.8.8	All Parties	The NPPF (December 2023) has been updated to include the following: " <i>The availability of agricultural land used for food production should be considered, alongside the other policies in this Framework, when deciding what sites are most appropriate for development</i> " (footnote 62). IPs are invited to comment.	Please see the response to question 2.2.2.

10 The historic environment

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.9.1	Applicant	The Applicant's response to ExQ1.9.3 [REP2-034] is noted, but the ExA is still unclear where information on the	As stated in paragraph 13.5.20 of ES Chapter 13: Cultural Heritage [APP-048] , Tables 13.23 to 13.26 assessed non-designated historic buildings that are located within 250m of

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>significance of non-designated heritage assets (buildings) can be found in the Applicant's submissions in order to inform the assessment in ES Chapter 13: Cultural Heritage [APP-048]. It is for the Applicant to provide such information – see paragraph 200 of the NPPF.</p> <p>If the Applicant is relying on a third-party source which details the significance for each asset, this should be provided.</p>	<p>the Sites. It is considered that a <i>Major</i> magnitude of change (and hence 'significant' effects) is unlikely to occur beyond this distance. For the cable route, it was considered that any temporary, short-term and reversible impacts to the settings of non-designated buildings would be of too low a magnitude to consider as part of the baseline.</p> <p>As stated in paragraph 13.5.19 of ES Chapter 13: Cultural Heritage [APP-048], there is currently no local list of built heritage assets in Lincolnshire. Consequently, the information on the significance of the non-designated heritage assets (buildings) assessed in the ES was largely derived from third party sources: The Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Records (HER) and the historic farmstead surveys undertaken as part of 'The Building the Evidence base for Historic Farmsteads in Greater Lincolnshire Project'¹. These data sources were compared, and it was identified that both datasets largely listed the same built heritage assets; buildings listed on the HER that were not present on 'The Building the Evidence base for Historic Farmsteads in Greater Lincolnshire Project', were identified as either being no longer extant or in one case, in a state of ruin. 'The Building the Evidence base for Historic Farmsteads in Greater Lincolnshire Project' was identified as containing a larger database of local built heritage, as well as information that could be used to identify</p>

¹ Lake, J. and Partington, A. 2015. *Building the evidence base for Historic Farmsteads in Greater Lincolnshire*. York: Archaeology Data Service, Online, <https://doi.org/10.5284/1035172>)

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>the significance of each asset and any potential impacts as a result of the Scheme (Appendix A).</p> <p>In discussing the significance of the historic farmsteads within the two National Character Areas within which the Cottam Scheme is located (i.e., NCA 45: <i>Northern Lincolnshire Edge with Coversands</i> and National Character Area 48: <i>Trent and Belvoir Vales</i>) this assessment explicitly distinguishes between 'high heritage potential' and 'some heritage potential' based upon a the level of survival of the traditional farmsteads identified (see Partington <i>et al</i>, 2015, <i>Greater Lincolnshire Farmstead Guidance: Farmstead and Landscape Statements</i>, p. 49 and p.74). Historic England's <i>The Greater Lincolnshire Farmstead Assessment Framework Guidelines for Best Practice</i> (Partington <i>et al</i> 2015, 9) also states that the greater the survival of the traditional elements of a farmstead, the greater its significance as a traditional farmstead is likely to be. In order to ascribe a level of significance to the non-designated historic buildings in accordance with the EIA methodology (i.e., as detailed in Table 13.5 in ES Chapter: 13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048], which uses the term 'value' rather than 'significance' so as not to confuse with the term 'significance of effects'), the value of each heritage asset was measured according to its level of survival (i.e. 'high heritage potential' or 'some heritage potential' equating to either 'Low' value or 'Negligible' value respectively). It was considered that this metric was sufficient for the purposes of the ES to ascertain the level of significance of the non-designated heritage assets assessed. This is considered to be in accordance with Historic England's guidance provided</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>within <i>The Setting of Heritage Assets</i> (HE 2017, 9) which states that: '<i>Local planning authorities are encouraged to work with applicants in order to minimise the need for detailed analysis of very large numbers of heritage assets...</i>' and: '<i>Where spatially extensive assessments relating to large numbers of heritage assets are required, Historic England recommends that local planning authorities give consideration to the practicalities and reasonableness of requiring assessors to access privately owned land</i>'.</p> <p>For further information, the full heritage asset descriptions of the non-designated historic buildings assessed in the ES, including their levels of survival (extracted from the <i>Digital Archive: English Heritage. 2015. English Heritage Farmsteads Project</i>) see Appendix A.</p>
2.9.2	Historic England	<p>With regard to the Thorpe Medieval Settlement Scheduled Monument (SM), can Historic England please explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) how the former historic east-west boundary relates to the significance of the SM; ii) what the setting of the asset to be in that direction; and iii) how the solar arrays would relate to the former historic east-west boundary and whether the proposed boundary 	

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>treatment has a bearing in this regard as mitigation.</p> <p>These were matters that were raised by the ExA at ISH2 where it concerned the historic environment.</p>	
2.9.3	Applicant/Historic England	Please provide an update on the position with the Thorpe Medieval Settlement SM, as it was understood from ISH2 that discussions were still ongoing and an agreed SoCG is outstanding.	Although the matter remains under discussion as outlined in the SoCG [REP-065], no resolution has been identified to date.
2.9.4	Historic England	Further to Historic England's response to ExQ1.9.8 [REP2-084] on Fillingham Castle, if the likely level of impact would be not worse than moderate would this equate to a potentially harmful impact? If so, please indicate whether Historic England considers it would be substantial or less than substantial.	
2.9.5	Historic England	Please comment on the revised outline Traffic Management Plan and in particular the provisions [REP3- 008] on movement management in relation to the boundary wall of the Site of a college and Benedictine Abbey, St Marys Church, Stow Scheduled Monument, at 6.14.	

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		Does Historic England consider that it would provide adequate protection against damage to this asset?	
2.9.6	Bassetlaw District Council	The ExA notes the Council's concerns in its Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP-080] in relation to the	
2.9.7	LCC, NCC	potential impact on the setting of heritage assets within the District. Please identify any specific heritage assets that the Council considers would be impacted in this way by the Proposed Development.	
2.9.8	LCC, NCC	LCC and NCC have both referred to percentages of how much of the Order limits should be the subject of trial trenching at this stage (2%,3-5%), including at ISH2. Please provide details of where these percentages are taken from, as regards guidance.	
2.9.9	Applicant, LCC, NCC	At ISH2, references were made to the percentages of trial trenching which had been sought on other developments in the area. The Applicant subsequently submitted a Comparison of Archaeological Evaluation Investigations	As stated in paragraph 1.1.8 of the Comparison of Archaeological Evaluation Investigations on Solar Schemes [REP3-041] a flexible approach to evaluation trenching should be undertaken <i>"with consideration to baseline information and, where available, the results of non-intrusive evaluation"</i> . The Applicant believes that the sample of evaluation trenching

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>on Solar Schemes document [REP3-041] which includes schemes in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire.</p> <p>To what extent do these sites (or some of these sites) share archaeological similarities with the Order limits and how does this translate to the 'need for a flexible approach to evaluation', as is set out in paragraph 1.1.8 of the Comparison of Archaeological Evaluation Investigations on Solar Schemes document [REP3-041]?</p>	<p>should be justified based on the archaeological evidence, and that a high sample of evaluation trenching for solar schemes, especially in blank areas, is only warranted when baseline information and the results of non-intrusive evaluation (i.e. geophysical survey, LiDAR, aerial photographic analysis) is not sufficient in fulfilling the Standard for Archaeological Field Evaluation as defined by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA):</p> <p><i>"An archaeological field evaluation will seek to determine, record and report on the nature, extent, preservation and significance of archaeological remains within a defined area"².</i></p> <p>Baseline information for the Scheme, including the results of non-intrusive evaluation, has been proven to be reliable in identifying concentrations of archaeological sites. The Applicant considered the approach recommended by the archaeological advisors for West Lindsey in Lincolnshire and Bassetlaw in Nottinghamshire of uninformed trenches across all areas within the Order Limits to does not take into account baseline information and is not therefore consistent with the guidance provided by CIfA. It is also considered to be unreasonable and disproportionate to the impact caused by the nature of the Scheme, which are key principles of NPS EN1</p>

² CIfA 2023, *Standard for Archaeological Field Evaluation*, Online (last accessed 22.01.2024)

<https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Standard%20for%20archaeological%20field%20evaluation.pdf>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>(paragraph 5.9.10) and NPPF (paragraph 200) as well as Policy S57 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.</p> <p>The Applicant considers the nature of archaeology and the results acquired by the evaluation techniques used to identify concentrations of archaeological remains within the Scheme are paralleled elsewhere in the East of England, and that there is no justification for an alternative approach to that which has been proven successful in assessing the archaeological potential of sites.</p> <p>As stated by LCC in their written summaries of oral submissions made at Hearings held during the week commencing 4th December 2023 [REP3-050], the Applicant agrees that the most directly comparable scheme is the Gate Burton Energy Park. Gate Burton is located c.2.2km to the west of Cottam 1. Both Schemes have bedrock geology of Lias Group mudstones with superficial deposits of alluvium, and Mid Pleistocene Till and glaciofluvial deposits. Undifferentiated river terrace deposits of sand and gravel are recorded solely in the Scheme, while sand and gravels of the Holme Pierrepont Member are recorded in the Gate Burton Scheme (BGS 2024³). The topography of both sites is relatively flat, and the land within the schemes comprises arable fields ([APP-131]; AECOM</p>

³ British Geology Survey, 2024, *Geology Viewer*, Online (last accessed 22.01.2024)
https://geologyviewer.bgs.ac.uk/?_ga=2.135059191.725147177.1697185368-158807321.1697185368

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>2023⁴). No extensive areas of magnetic disturbance, either caused by geological changes in the substrata or modern activity, are present in geophysical data sets acquired by the Scheme or the Gate Burton scheme. Archaeological baseline information is equally similar, and numerous archaeological sites were identified by archaeological evaluation within both schemes, which are largely comprised of enclosures, ditches and pits that were assessed as being indicative of activity dated between the Iron Age and Medieval periods. Six mitigation areas are identified in the Gate Burton Energy Park Archaeology Mitigation Strategy. Of these, five sites were detected by geophysical survey and confirmed by evaluation trial trenching. A further mitigation area focused on a rectilinear feature was identified by aerial photo and LiDAR mapping, which when trenched was identified as being of an uncertain origin (either archaeological or geological). No features were identified as requiring archaeological mitigation in 'blank' areas where non-intrusive evaluation techniques had not identified a potential for archaeological remains to be present⁵.</p>

⁴ AECOM, 2023 Gate Burton Energy Park: *Archaeological Mitigation Strategy Part 1*, Online (last accessed 22.01.2024)
https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010131/EN010131-001241-7.6_Archaeological%20Mitigation%20Strategy_Part%201_Solar%20Park_CHANGE%20REQUEST%20VERSION_clean.pdf

⁵ *Ibid.*

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.9.10	Applicant	Please explain how concrete feet can be deployed in areas that have not been trial trenched without the potential for damage.	As detailed in paragraph 7.1.10 ES Appendix 13.7 Archaeological Mitigation WSI [EN010133/C6.3.13.7_A] no areas have been proposed for concrete feet that have not already been subject to evaluation trial trenching.
2.9.11	Applicant	The Applicant considered at ISH2 that it was appropriate to apply guidance from other parts of the country in relation to the use of concrete feet. How would this approach specifically relate to the archaeology which is found in this part of Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire, as opposed to elsewhere such as the Cornwall example cited at ISH2.	<p>The broad archaeological chronology, type and depth of features found within Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire do not differ from other regions within the UK to the extent that alternative evaluation and mitigation techniques are required. For example, archaeological sites within the Scheme are generally composed of a series of ditches and pits of varying dimension and depth, which is common across England.</p> <p>Examples of the use of concrete feet have been identified across England on sites with varying archaeological features and soil geomorphology demonstrating that the mitigation technique is not limited to a single county, region or type of archaeological site. Examples of the application of concrete feet include: The Grange (19/01408/FULM) in Nottinghamshire, Land south-east Of A6108 Darlington Road (21/00931/FULL) in North Yorkshire, Eastfield Farm (19/04321/STPLF) in East Riding of Yorkshire, Conesby Solar Park (PA/2018/2140) in North Lincolnshire, Vine Farm, Shingay-cum-Wendy (S/1067/14/FL) in Cambridgeshire.</p>
2.9.12	Historic England, LCC, NCC	Please comment on the Archaeological Trial Trenching Evaluation Fieldwork Report for the Shared Cable Corridor	

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		document submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 3 [REP3-049].	
2.9.13	Applicant	Paragraphs 13.7.16–7 of ES Chapter:13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048] indicates where there are significant effects. Why does this not include AR24, as the effect is indicated as significant in the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Tables [APP-132] and ES Chapter 23: Summary of Significant Effects [REP2-010].	<i>Large Adverse</i> (i.e., 'significant' effects) at AR24 were discussed in the fourth bullet point in the previous paragraph (paragraph 13.7.15). Whilst this point was not re-iterated in the discussion in paragraphs 13.7.16-17, its inclusion in Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Tables [APP-132] and ES Chapter 23: Summary of Significant Effects [REP2-010] means that it has been taken into account.
2.9.14	Applicant, LCC, NCC	The ExA notes that the Statements of Common Ground are being updated with LCC (and presumably NCC) to show where there is agreement and disagreement over the Archaeological Mitigation WSI [APP-131] to reflect ongoing discussions. The final versions to be submitted at Deadline 5 need to set out clearly where the areas of agreement and disagreement are at the close of the Examination (and please avoid the use of comment boxes in the final versions).	Statements of Common Ground continue to be under discussion with both LCC and NCC. A Without Prejudice Written Scheme of Investigation is under preparation, following which the Applicant will look to receive comments from LCC and NCC with the aim of seeking agreement. The Applicant acknowledges that final version of the Statement of Common Ground will need to clearly set out areas of disagreement and not use comment boxes.
2.9.15	Applicant	Further to the Applicant's response to ExQ1.9.24 [REP2-034], the Applicant is to	A definitive list of heritage assets that specifies the level of harm is provided in Appendix B. Within Appendix B, cumulative

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		set out a definitive list of where there would be harm to heritage assets (to be identified individually), In the case of each designated asset, the level of harm (whether less than substantial, or substantial) is to be set out (individually). Cumulative effects are also to be included.	effects are set in the table 'Residual cumulative effects following mitigation: Operational Phase'.
2.9.16	Applicant	<p>Further to the submission of the revised Joint Report on Interrelationships [REP3-027], it appears the assessment on the cumulative effect on Scampton Villa has now changed from moderate to slight. Please confirm if this is correct.</p> <p>The revised Joint Report on Interrelationships [REP3-027] though still states that "No significant cumulative impacts identified for other heritage assets". So is this suggesting there still would be a significant cumulative impact on Scampton Villa. Please clarify, given the language used.</p>	<p>The Joint Report on Interrelationships [REP3-027], states the cumulative effect on the Scampton Villa would be Slight Adverse. This reassessment was based on a site visit in December 2023. This is not considered significant in EIA terms, and so no significant cumulative impacts have been identified for heritage assets as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Joint Report on Interrelationships [EX4/C8.1.8_C] has been amended to correct this discrepancy.</p>
2.9.17	Applicant	The ExA notes that the updated NTS [REP2-022] provided at Deadline 2 refers (at paragraph 6.8.8) to a number of	The Applicant acknowledges the error to paragraph 6.8.8 in the update of the NTS [REP2-022] provided at Deadline 2.

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		assets where the effects have been assessed as beneficial. However, this appears at odds with what is stated at paragraph 6.8.9 and the findings of ES Chapter 9. Please can the Applicant carry out a further review of the information presented in the NTS and update accordingly (if necessary for all topic areas)	An updated version of NTS [EN010133/EX4/C6.5_C] is provided at Deadline 4 that resolves this error.

11 Transport and access, highways and public rights of way

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.10.1	Applicant	The Applicant's Response to ExQ1.10.7 [REP2-034] sets out measures to enable abnormal load deliveries. Can the Applicant therefore confirm that, apart from at specified access points, hedgerow removal is not proposed to accommodate such deliveries, e.g. alongside country lanes that will be utilised for access.	In addition to hedgerow removal at specified access points, some hedgerow removal may be required at the right turn from the B1241 into Cot Garth Lane for Cottam 1. This section is included within the Order limits. Elsewhere, there may be a need for some pruning of trees and vegetation in isolated locations and depending on growth at the time of the abnormal load movement.
2.10.2	Applicant	To what standard will employee parking and visitor parking be provided, along with turning space (to enable entering/exiting in first gear) and HGV	As part of the construction compounds, car and minibus parking will be provided. At this stage, it is not clear exactly how many parking spaces will be required per compound. However, the number will reflect the

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>waiting bays. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP3-008] makes limited reference to such considerations.</p>	<p>commitment to ensure that as many workers as possible arrive to the Site via minibus.</p> <p>Typically, a construction compound will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parking spaces; • Minibus parking spaces; • Space for loading and unloading vehicles; • A turning area to ensure vehicles arrive and depart in a forward gear; • Storage areas for equipment; • Refuse and recycling store; • Welfare facilities. <p>Full details of the construction compounds, including parking and turning circles will be set out in the Final CTMPs, secured through Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 of C3.1_F Draft Development Consent Order Revision F [EN010133/EX4/C3.1_F].</p>
2.10.3	Applicant	<p>The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP3-008] now refers to a Joint Construction Traffic Management Plan at 7.2 (xxvi). However, it states that such a document "could" be produced. Why cannot it be more definitive given the number of proposed</p>	<p>As set out within the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs [EN010133/EX4/C8.1.8_C], <i>"At present there is no certainty that the other schemes will be consented and therefore that a Joint CTMP would be required. If they are all consented, they may be subject to different requirements on construction traffic or timescales, which may make production of one document across all projects challenging. No single party has authority over another and</i></p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>schemes in this area and to ensure that such a document is produced?</p> <p>Why also does it not mention Tillbridge/other schemes which may be consented in the event that construction schedules overlap?</p>	<p><i>each DCO only controls the activities for that project. For all these reasons, a firm commitment cannot be made to prepare or agree a Joint CTMP. Notwithstanding the above, it is the developers' intention to together develop a Joint CTMP and this approach has been agreed between the parties as evidenced in this report and the cooperation agreement".</i></p> <p>Other schemes have not been included to date, as DCO applications have not been made. Notwithstanding this, the wording in relation to the Joint CTMP within Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/EX4/C6.3.14.2_E] has been updated to reference the potential for other schemes to be included.</p>
2.10.4	Applicant	<p>With regard to the submissions made by WLDC and 7000 Acres at ISH4, and the Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs [REP3-027], the Applicant's views are sought on whether there would be the potential for broader adverse amenity impacts due to the prolonged period that there would be additional construction traffic on the local highway network, in particular due to the cumulative effects (irrespective of whether the roads in highway terms are capable of accommodating this traffic).</p>	<p>HGVs associated with the cumulative schemes will be spread around the highway network. For example, HGVs associated with the Cottam Scheme will use the A1500, Ingham Lane/Stow Lane, the A631 and B1205. Vehicles associated with the West Burton Scheme will use the A1500, A57 and B1241. The Gate Burton Scheme HGV route utilises the A156, and the Tillbridge Scheme HGVs will utilise the A631. All HGVs will not be using the same route at the same time.</p> <p>Therefore, the key roads which will have a cumulative effect if all schemes are constructed at the same time are the A15, A1500 and A631. All of these roads are A-Roads which support significant HGV movement. The local roads that have been</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>identified as the construction vehicle routes for the Cottam Scheme will not be used by the other cumulative schemes.</p> <p>Therefore, there are not expected to be broader amenity effects as a result of cumulative construction vehicle movement.</p>
2.10.5	Applicant	<p>It is still unclear to the ExA where the conclusions on cumulative effects on the highway network are drawn from as set out at paragraph 14.9.5 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049]. Please point to what figures have been utilised to come to this view.</p> <p>The Joint Report on Interrelationships between NSIPs [REP3-027] does not appear to provide further substantive evidence in this regard, beyond stating there would be no changes from the ES.</p>	<p>Table 14.27 of the ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] sets out the number of vehicles associated with the cumulative schemes. This was based on available information at the time of writing. Since this time, a PEIR has been submitted for the Tillbridge Scheme. This does not significantly change the assumptions made for this Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant also refers to its response to ExQ 2.10.4 above.</p> <p>As set out in paragraph 4.8 of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/C6.3.14.2_E], there will be approximate 16 HGV deliveries and 16 LGV deliveries per day associated with the cable route corridor. These trips will be spread over four accesses (four HGVs and four LGVs per access). The HGV routes to the cable route corridor for each scheme differ, except for the joint element. This level of vehicle trip generation will not result in a significant cumulative effect.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, as set out in paragraph 7.2 (xxvi) of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/C6.3.14.2_E], a Joint CTMP could be implemented in the event that the construction schedules associated with this Scheme and other schemes in the area (namely West Burton and</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Gate Burton) overlap. Other Schemes that come forward in the area could be included as appropriate.</p> <p>In light of this, paragraph 14.9.6 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] concludes that the cumulative effects for Transport and Access will not change, as compared to the residual effects, i.e. temporary and not significant.</p>

12 Noise, vibration, air quality, and nuisance

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.11.1	Applicant	<p>ES Chapter 2: EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037] states "2.4.18: <i>Following the classification of an effect, clear statements will be made within the topic chapters as to whether that effect is significant or not significant. As a rule, major and moderate effects are generally considered to be significant, whilst minor and negligible effects are considered to be not significant. However, professional judgement will be applied, including taking account of whether the effect is permanent or temporary, its duration / frequency,</i></p>	<p>Our previous response to this question (Question 1.11.1 of [REP2-034]) stated that a moderate magnitude of change is equivalent to the significant observed adverse effect level in the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE).</p> <p>A moderate magnitude of change combined with a high sensitivity receptor i.e residential would equate to an impact of major/moderate significance of effect.</p> <p>The moderate significance of effect is equivalent to a minor magnitude of change coupled to a high sensitivity receptor. A moderate significance of effect is not considered significant in EIA terms because the magnitude of change that is required to achieve this impact would be less than the threshold criteria for a significant observed adverse effect level in line with NPSE. The determination of a moderate significance of effect is outlined in</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p><i>whether it is reversible, and / or its likelihood of occurrence."</i></p> <p>Please confirm what professional judgment you have applied in not considering moderate as a significant effect and why you have defined the moderate magnitude as the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level, as is set out in Applicant to ExQ1.11.1 [REP2-034].</p> <p>If the ExA and the Secretary of State decided that moderate effects are significant, how would this alter the findings of ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [APP-050]? Please explain your answer.</p>	<p>the EIA assessment methodology, ES Chapter 2:EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037].</p> <p>If the ExA and the Secretary of State decided that moderate effects are significant, the conclusion of the assessment would not change as there are considered to be no moderate effects during the operational or construction phase.</p>
2.11.2	WDLC	The Applicant responded to the Council's comments in its LIR on the noise methodology, surveys, sources and assumptions in its Response to LIRs [REP2-047]. Has this addressed the Council's concerns?	
2.11.3	Applicant	Further to the Applicant's response to ExQ1.11.9 [REP2-034], do solar panels emit low frequency noise and has this been considered in the noise assessment?	As stated in the response to Question 1.11.9 of [REP2-034], the solar panels themselves do not emit any noise. All noise emitted is from the inverters which service the solar panels and inverter noise is considered in Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [APP -

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			050.Low frequency noise from the inverters has been accounted for in the assessment.
2.11.4	Applicant	Does the Applicant's response to ExQ1.11.10 [REP2-034] account for acoustic reflection from the panels and that some of the bunds around the Blyton Park Driving Centre circuit, which are said to act as noise mitigation from the use of the circuit, would seem to be removed under the Proposed Development by virtue of them lying in the proposed areas of solar arrays?	Deflection of noise from Blyton Park Driving Centre is considered in ES Addendum: Blyton Park Driving Centre [EN010133/EX4/C8.4.21.2] submitted at Deadline 4. A Noise Impact Assessment of Reflection of Noise is included at Appendix A of that document.
2.11.5	UKHSA	<p>A number of documents concerning fire risk and battery storage have been revised by the Applicant since the application and an agreed SoCG was submitted. These include the Air Quality Impact Assessment of a Solar Fire Incident [REP-078], Air Quality Impact Assessment of BESS Fire [REP-079] and Revised Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [REP3-018].</p> <p>Please clarify whether the revisions of these documents affect/alter the views of UKHSA as set out in its RR [RR-044].</p>	

13 Socio-economics, tourism, and recreation

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.12.1	Applicant	Further to the Applicant's response to ExQ1 at 1.12.8 [REP2-034] over why the Automotive Research and Development Centre at Blyton Park was not included in the peak cumulative development year of 2026, would its inclusion alter the conclusions reached on economic impacts? Please explain your answer.	<p>The construction of the proposed Automotive Research and Development Centre at Blyton Park has for the purpose of assessment been estimated to generate a net 37.5 FTE construction jobs and an indirect and induced 67.5 FTE jobs. This equates to an approximate 2.5% increase in the total employment from the projects that make up the cumulative assessment.</p> <p>If this is included in the assessment of cumulative construction projects in 2026 as set out in Section 18.10 of C6.2.18 ES Chapter 18_Socio Economics Tourism and Recreation [APP-053], this increases the number of construction, and overall jobs created in the Local and Regional Impact Areas, and has a related rise in gross value added to the local and regional economies. The assessment would not however change in its conclusions on significance of effects, as no employment or economic effect is changed into a higher magnitude bracket.</p> <p>Separately, C8.4.21.2 ES Addendum 21.2: Blyton Park Driving Centre [EN010133/EX4/C8.4.21.2] demonstrates that the Scheme is not anticipated to adversely effect the economic performance of the Blyton Park Driving Centre complex, including its proposed Automotive Research & Development Centre.</p>
2.12.2	Applicant	Paragraph 193 of the NPPF raises matters related to the 'agent of change' principle	The Applicant is confident that the agent of change principle does not apply as the location of the Scheme adjacent to the

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		in that existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Would this arise in this case in light of the concerns that LNT have set out in its Deadline 2 submission [REP2-085] and during the December hearings?	race track at Blyton Park will not cause unreasonable restrictions on their operations. In response to the concerns raised by LNT Group, the Applicant has prepared ES Addendum 21.2: Blyton Park Driving Centre [EN010133/EX4/C8.4.21.2] which provides a technical response to the environmental and operational matters at the race track. The document also demonstrates the options under discussion with LNT Group to ensure that their concerns are being suitably accommodated in the Scheme design.
2.12.3	Applicant	<p>The outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP3-008] at 3.11 sets out that specific management of the access during race days and other events will be put in place in consultation with the operators of Blyton Park Driving Centre, to ensure their operations are not significantly affected by the construction vehicle movements.</p> <p>It is understood that Blyton Park Driving Centre is used most days of the year (300 days plus) and the access is used as a paddock and for parking. Please provide examples of the management measures proposed and how they will ensure any resultant restrictions or impacts on the Driving Centre would be reasonable</p>	<p>The Applicant has included this matter within section 3.1 of the ES Addendum 21.2: Blyton Park Driving Centre [EN010133/EX4/C8.4.21.2] submitted at Deadline 4.</p> <p>Management measures that could be put in place include the provision of extra banksmen, to support construction vehicle movements, and ensure the safety of other users of the access. Banksmen or operatives could have the powers to direct traffic. The measures will be developed in consultation with the operators of Blyton Park Driving Centre. Measures may include reducing the number of HGV movements to and from the Site at the beginning and end of race events when participants and spectators are entering and egressing the Driving Centre complex.</p> <p>These measures are reflected in an update to paragraph 3.11 of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010133/EX4/C6.3.14.2_E].</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			Final CTMPs will be secured through Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 of C3.1_F Draft Development Consent Order Revision F [EN010133/EX4/C3.1_F].
2.12.4	LNT	<p>The ExA requests details of the following:</p> <p>(i) Available details on the contribution of Blyton Park Driving Centre to the local economy, including employment and skills, economic activity and supply chains; and</p> <p>(ii) Whether the consented Automotive Research and Development Centre would involve land in or close to the Order limits and the predicted employment and contribution to the local economy, as well as an update on the timescales for the implementation of the project.</p>	
2.12.5	EDF	<p>The Applicant has raised a number of matters in its response to ExQ1.12.11 on the Priority Regeneration Area at the Cottam Power Station, centred on that the proposed cable route would not prejudice it. Does EDF have comments it wishes to make in this regard?</p>	

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.12.6	Bassetlaw District Council	Noting the Council's comments in its LIR [REP-080], does it consider that the proposal would comply with draft Policy ST6 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038?	
2.12.7	Applicant	The Applicant stated during the December hearings that it was going to look at the health impact matters that had been raised. Please provide an update at Deadline 4.	The Applicant has provided ES Addendum 21.1: Human Health [EN010133/EX4/C8.4.21.1] in response to the matters raised at Agenda Item 4 of ISH 4. This document provides a comprehensive collation of human health matters assessed throughout the ES [APP-036 to APP-058] .
2.12.8	Applicant	<p>7000 Acres in its response to ExQ1.12.18 [REP2-094] referred to two Gypsy and Traveller sites in the vicinity of the Order limits in relation to the potential for increased flood risk on those communities.</p> <p>The Applicant's submissions in ES Chapter 18 Socio Economics, Tourism and Recreation [APP-053], Planning Statement [REP2-028] and the Equality Impact Assessment [APP-351] do not appear to have identified or considered these communities, nor potential effects on them.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded directly to the comments made by 7000 Acres at 1.12.18 (pg. 87-88) of C8.1.27 Applicant Response to Deadline 2 Submissions [REP3-039].</p> <p>Given the distance between the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation sites and the Order Limits, the potential impacts on the Gypsy and Traveller communities were not assessed. Acknowledging known health or deprivation inequalities within the community, it was not anticipated that these groups were likely to be disproportionately impacted by the Scheme with regard to socio-economic, and health and wellbeing impacts, nor at a greater risk of flooding or social isolation as a result of the Scheme. As such, the Applicant is confident that no breach of either the Human Rights Act (1998) or the Equality Act (2010) has occurred, or will occur as a result of the development of the Scheme.</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		Accordingly, the Applicant's views are sought in this regard, as well as on the application of the Human Rights Act (1998) and the Equality Act (2010), and the duties they contain.	
2.12.9	Applicant	<p>The Applicant's response to ExQ1.12.19 [REP2-034] limits its response to 7000 Acres' concern over Article 8 of the Human Rights Act (1998) to matters related to compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>As Article 8 concerns the right to respect for their private and family life, their home and their correspondence, how would the Proposed Development fare in relation to the broader impact on local communities in the area under the Article?</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider that the development of the Scheme impacts upon any individual or groups' human rights. Of the Articles in the Human Rights Act (1998) that may be considered to potentially impacted by the Scheme, these are Article 8: Respect for your private and family life, home and correspondence, and Article 14: Protection from discrimination in respect of these rights and freedoms.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider that the Scheme impacts upon any individual or groups' right to private life or home, nor on any individual or groups' right to peaceful enjoyment of property as set out in Protocol 1, Article 1, solely by virtue of being near to where an individual or group lives, or their enjoyment of views from their property or properties. The Applicant's response to ExQ1.12.19 [REP2-034] is limited to discussion on compulsory acquisition as this is the only conceivable way that the Scheme may impacts upon the right protected by Article 8.</p> <p>The Applicant is furthermore confident that the Scheme does not discriminate or victimise any group as protected under the Equality Act (2010), and thus adheres to Article 14 of the Human Rights Act (1998).</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.12.10	Applicant	The Applicant's comments are sought on the details of the claimed paths that LCC has provided in its responses to ExQ1 at 1.12.26 [REP2-073, REP2-074]. Would this have a bearing on the implementation of the Proposed Development and opportunities for enhancement? Please explain your answer	The Applicant cannot comment on the validity of the applications made. However, in the event that the applications are successful, the Applicant considers that any new PRow will not impede the implementation of the Scheme and can be appropriately managed using the powers in the draft DCO and the measures in the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan. The claimed paths are included within C2.5_D Public Rights of Way Plan [EN010133/EX4/C2.5_D] .
2.12.11	Applicant	During ISH3, the Applicant made a number of comments about updating the outline Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP) [APP-349], including its relationship with the Organisational Framework, monitoring and consultation with the host authorities. Please provide an updated oSSCEP at Deadline 4.	An updated Outline Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan Revision A [EN010133/EX4/C7.10_A] has been submitted to the examination at Deadline 4.

14 Other planning matters

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
Waste			
2.13.1	Applicant	The ExA notes that ES Chapter 20 [APP-055] indicates that the waste baseline	The information that informs the baseline conditions in C6.2.20 ES Chapter 20: Waste [APP-055] is based on the

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		only covers the period up to 2038. As the expected lifetime of the Proposed Development is intended to be considerably longer than that, how accurate is the assessment of waste effects?	<p>most up-to-date Waste Needs Assessments from both Lincolnshire County Council and from Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council as the relevant waste authorities for the Scheme. Whilst it is acknowledged that this is only reliable up to 2038, this is the only suitable information against which this assessment can be undertaken. The Applicant has no reasonable method of understanding what addition waste handling resources will be available in future. Given that there is likely to be a need for waste handling facilities for solar infrastructure in the future, the 2038 baseline wherein there is no specific waste handling facilities is very much a worst-case scenario, but is the most reasonable scenario for assessment at this stage.</p> <p>The Applicant is cognisant of the need to ensure waste is handled properly in accordance with local and national guidance. As such, the requirement for monitoring of waste management throughout the operational lifetime of the Scheme, and ahead of decommissioning, are secured through the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010133/EX4/C7.16_C] and Outline Decommissioning Statement [REP3-014]. These outline documents are secured by Requirements 14 and 21 respectively of Schedule 2 to C3.1_F Draft Development Consent Order Revision F [EN010133/EX4/C3.1_F].</p>
2.13.2	Applicant	Further to the Applicant's response to ExQ1.13.2 [REP2-034], under what process would substantive changes be	As stated in the Applicant's response to ExQ1.13.2 [REP2-034], monitoring requirements for waste during the operational lifetime of the Scheme are set out in Table 3.13

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>assessed beyond 2038, considering the ES should assess the worst-case scenario.</p> <p>The ExA also understands from the Applicant's submission at ISH1 and ISH5 that a greater level of environmental effect in any event would be a deemed refusal.</p>	<p>of C7.16 Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN0101033/EX4/C7.16_C].</p> <p>This includes the following monitoring requirement:</p> <p><i>"The Waste Management Strategy should be updated periodically, as and when waste local plans in the host waste authorities are updated, to ensure that forecasts for waste handling capacity throughout operation, and at the projected point of decommissioning, are kept up to date to ensure adverse effects can be suitable mitigated."</i></p> <p>In practice, this is the process under which the Scheme's operator should keep up-to-date with waste handling scenarios in the host waste authority areas. This should then be used to ensure ongoing operational waste streams are sent to waste handling facilities with the greatest level of capacity to handle these waste streams. This monitoring requirement also feeds into the final Decommissioning Waste Management Strategy (as secured through Outline Decommissioning Statement [REP3-014]) which ensures <i>"decommissioning waste streams are sent to waste recycling and handling facilities that have sufficient capacity to handle waste arisings from the Scheme without adversely impacting upon their capacity to handle waste arisings for all other waste streams in the authority area."</i></p> <p>The Applicant is furthermore confident that the assessment made in C6.2.20 ES Chapter 20: Waste [APP-055] is a</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>reasonable worst-case scenario, as it assesses against a baseline wherein there is a shortfall of handling capacity in one of the two host waste authorities, and no specific waste handling facilities for solar PV or battery storage have been included.</p> <p>Sub-paragraph (5) of paragraph 2 to Schedule 17 of the C3.1_F Draft Development Consent Order Revision F [EN010133/EX4/C3.1_F] provides that where an application made to the relevant planning authority for any consent, agreement or approval required by a Requirement, the application must include a statement setting out if the application is likely to give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects compared to those in the Environmental Statement [APP-035 to APP-146]. Where the application is likely to give rise to any materially new or different environmental effects, at the end of the period of ten weeks, the application is deemed to have been refused if it has not been determined. A greater level of environmental effect does not therefore result in a deemed refusal in any event, but is subject to the controls of Schedule 17.</p> <p>However, Schedule 17 needs to be read in conjunction with Requirement 3 which provides that any amendments to any approved management plans "<i>must not be given except where it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the relevant planning authority that the subject matter of the approval</i></p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			<i>sought is unlikely to give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects from those assessed in the environmental statement."</i>
2.13.3	LCC/Applicant	<p>The ExA notes that LCC has set out in its response to ExQ1.13.2 [REP2-073] that paragraph 1.13.2 of the Waste ES Chapter [APP-055] does not seem to match with the Council's Waste Needs Assessment. Can you explain please.</p> <p>The Applicant's response is also sought on this matter.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to the comments raised by Lincolnshire County Council on 1.13.2 (pg. 97-101) [REP3-039] which sets out how the figures used in C6.2.20 ES Chapter 20: Waste [APP-055] have been derived from the Waste Needs Assessment 2021.</p>
2.13.4	Applicant	<p>Can the Applicant provide further details of how the recycling of solar array infrastructure would take place over the operational period of the Proposed Development in light of that it is recognised that there are no facilities that specifically handle waste solar infrastructure in the host authority areas/local impact area?</p>	<p>On the basis that there are no specific facilities, the assessment in C6.2.20 ES Chapter 20: Waste [APP-055] has been based on waste recycling facilities for overall Waste Electronics and Electrical Equipment handling capabilities in the host waste authority areas. Until such a time as specific solar PV and infrastructure waste handling facilities become available, recycling of solar panels is expected to be undertaken by general WEEE handlers. This is specifically the case for the solar PV panels themselves, electrical cabling, and inverters. Batteries are required to be separated from WEEE so that they can be recovered, recycled, or disposed of in accordance with the Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009 (or the most up-to-date legislation at the point of the waste stream arising). Non-WEEE arisings (such as the mounting</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			structures and more generalised construction, demolition and excavation (C, D&E) waste can be handled in the same way as similar non-WEEE arisings from any other type of development.
2.13.5	Applicant	The Applicant has set out in its response to ExQ1.13.8 [REP2-034] how it intends to deal with the deficit of landfill waste handling in Nottinghamshire from 2029. Would this mitigation also be impacted by the baseline covering up to 2038 only, in terms of what might be needed after that date? How would mitigation be addressed after 2038 if it is not known what the baseline and therefore the level of effect would be?	Please see the Applicant's response to question 2.13.1 above.
2.13.6	Applicant	With regard to the Review of Likely Significant Effects at 60 Years document [REP2-058], please explain how effects on waste would not be impacted by a 60-year operational period, given the deficit in waste handling in Nottinghamshire from 2029. How can it be assured that the measures in the Operational Environmental Management Plan	As there is a known waste (landfill) handling deficit from the year 2029, and the known waste handling capacity is only available up to 2038 for Nottinghamshire, the Applicant has applied the 2038 waste handling capacity figure as its baseline condition for all years thereafter. As a result, the year-by-year operational effects are not anticipated to change. It is therefore not anticipated that the significance of any operational impacts are likely to change up to 60 years.

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		[REP3-022] would still be effective over that longer period, including with regard to waste handling capacity.	<p>Similarly, decommissioning effects are not anticipated to change as a result of decommissioning being undertaken after 40 years versus 60 years, as the waste handling capacity for both instances is based on the worst case of 2038 waste handling baseline.</p> <p>The measures set out in the C7.16 Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN0101033/EX4/C7.16_C] are secured by Requirement 14 of Schedule 2 of the draft Development Consent Order [EN010133/EX4/C3.1_F] and as such</p>
2.13.7	Applicant	In light of the deficit of landfill waste handling in Nottinghamshire coupled with the baseline covering up to 2038 only, what, if any, joint arrangements would be put in place with other nearby NSIP solar projects and how would this be addressed through the DCO?	At present, no joint arrangements are being proposed with other NSIP solar projects as it is not known how the market will respond in the future to the increasing need for recycling facilities for solar panels. That notwithstanding, the nearby West Burton Solar Project [EN010132] has the same monitoring and mitigation requirements as the Cottam Solar Project, and as such have a complementary approach to ensuring effects on waste handling are effectively mitigated.
2.13.8	LCC/Applicant	The ExA notes that LCC has responded [REP2-073] to waste questions that were directed at the Applicant through ExQ1. The questions largely relate to the application documentation, which LCC would have had sight of previously. Given the stage of the Examination, LCC and the Applicant are	The Statement of Common Ground with Lincolnshire County Council [EX4/C8.3.2_C] has been updated to set out the latest position on waste matters.

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		asked to utilise the SoCG to set out the matters of agreement and disagreement on waste in relation to these matters.	
2.13.9	LCC	Further to LCC's response to ExQ1.13.14 [REP2-073], the Outline Decommissioning Statement [REP3-014] has now been revised for provision for a waste management plan to be submitted. Does this address LCC's concerns?	
Electromagnetic Fields			
2.13.11	Applicant/Environment Agency	<p>The Environment Agency's views are sought on the submitted 'Risk Assessment on EMF Impacts on Fish' document which is appended to the Applicant's Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submission and responses at Issue Specific Hearing 3 and Responses to Action Points [REP3-034].</p> <p>The Applicant is also asked to confirm whether this has the potential to have a bearing on the revised Information to Support a Habitats Regulations</p>	<p>The Applicant has discussed this issue with the Environment Agency in January 2024, seeking their opinion following submission of the Risk Assessment document. The Applicant understands that the EA are satisfied with the conclusion that risks to fish from EMF associated with the cable crossing of the Trent are sufficiently low. The Applicant is updating the Statement of Common Ground with the EA to categorise this as an agreed matter, which will be submitted in due course. The Applicant understands that the EA will request that monitoring of the location of the river crossing for impacts on fish is undertaken pre and post construction. Consequently, the Applicant believes that the conclusions of the Information to Support a Habitats Regulations</p>

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		Assessment document [REP3-024] submitted at Deadline 3, as regards the sea and river lamprey.	Assessment document [REP3-024] remain applicable and correct.
2.13.12	Applicant	Has the effect of electromagnetic fields from the Proposed Development on the motor vehicle activity at Blyton Driving Centre and the proposed Research and Development facility been considered, a matter which is raised in LNT Group's submission at Deadline 2 [REP2-085]? Please explain your answer.	The Applicant has responded to this matter within ES Addendum 21.2: Blyton Park Driving Centre [EN010133/EX4/C8.4.21.2] submitted at Deadline 4.
Telecommunications, Utilities and TV:			
2.13.13	Uniper	Please provide further explanation over Uniper's reservations and concerns [REP-101] in respect of the Proposed Development and its assets at Cottam Power station.	
Major Accidents and Disasters			
2.13.14	Applicant	Will the BESS containers be stacked? If so, please explain how the risk to fire loading, potential fire spread and restrictions on access would be satisfactorily addressed?	The Applicant can confirm that the BESS enclosures will not be stacked.

15 Compulsory Acquisition and related matters

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
2.14.1	Applicant/LNT Aviation (Blyton Park Driving Centre)	Please provide an update on discussions in relation to CA matters.	Please refer to C8.1.11 Schedule of Progress regarding objections and agreements in relation to Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession, other land rights, and blight [EX4/C8.1.9_C].
2.14.2	Applicant	The Schedule of Negotiations [REP3 -031] and the Schedule of Progress regarding Protective Provisions and Statutory Undertakers [REP3-032] identify a number of plots for which the owners object to the CA of their land. The Applicant has indicated that it is hopeful that agreement will be reached soon. Where such agreement is reached, does the Applicant anticipate the formal withdrawal of the objection?	<p>The Applicant confirms that it expects statutory undertakers who have registered an objection will withdraw their objection once an agreement is reached.</p> <p>In respect of individual landowners, the Applicant does not expect objections to necessarily be withdrawn once an agreement is reached, although the affected party may choose to do so. This is because an individual may wish to maintain an objection to the Scheme in principle, notwithstanding it has agreed terms for the acquisition of land or rights in the event the Scheme is granted consent.</p>
2.14.3	Applicant	Please provide an update on discussions with the owners of plots 17-361, 10-221, 10-222 and 10-223.	Negotiations are ongoing with parties. These have been reopened with Brown and Co in relation to the Kimberleys and a set of standard Heads of Terms have been issued to the Sharps for their comments and are currently sat with the landowner for comments.
2.14.4	Applicant	Please confirm that Bonsdale Solar Farm Limited have been made aware of its	Bonsdale Solar Farm Limited is part of Island Green Power and therefore aware of the Scheme. The Applicant can confirm that a

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		addition to the BoR in respect of plot number 02-044.	Notice of Invitation to register as an Interested Party under Section 102A of the Planning Act 2008 was sent to Bonsdale Solar Farm Limited on the 6 th December 2023 via Royal Mail Tracked 24 Service. Proof of delivery was confirmed by Royal Mail on the 7 th December 2023.
2.14.5	Applicant	Please identify any key potential risks inherent in securing the necessary funds to construct the project.	<p>The Applicant refers to the Funding Statement [AS-057] which confirms at paragraph 2.2.1, that the Applicant is able to procure the necessary funds to construct the Scheme through its parent company IGP.</p> <p>The current cost estimate of the Scheme is £850-900 million and this figure takes into account recent global events, supply chain constraints, fluctuations in commodity prices and potential changes in inflation and interest rates.</p> <p>IGP and its shareholders are experienced solar and energy developers and have secured funds for numerous other energy projects. As set out in paragraph 2.2.4 of the Funding Statement [AS-057], advice has been sought from numerous professionals on the viability of the Scheme. The Applicant believes that its approach has ensured that it has minimised any risk of it being unable to secure the necessary funds to construct the Scheme.</p>
2.14.6	Applicant	Annex C of the Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land indicates (at para 4) that where it is necessary for the Land	In all places where a plot of land is referred to within the draft Development Consent Order [EX4/C3.1], the sheet number is

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>Plan to have more than one sheet, appropriate references must be made to each of them in the text of the draft order so that there is no doubt that they are all related to the order.</p> <p>Please include appropriate references in Schedule 14 of the dDCO.</p>	<p>included in the reference. Each plot number is in the format [sheet number]-[plot number].</p> <p>The Applicant is confident that it has fully complied with paragraph 5 of Annex C, and no changes to Schedule 14 are necessary.</p>

Appendix A

Non-Designated Historic Buildings – English Heritage Farmsteads Project asset descriptions from ‘The Building the Evidence base for Historic Farmsteads in Greater Lincolnshire Project’

Receptor	HER ID	EH Farmsteads Project asset description	Survival
HB1: Thorpe le Fallows Farm, Thorpe in the Fallows	MLI118749	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Loose courtyard with three sides of the courtyard formed by working agricultural buildings. The farmhouse is detached from the main working complex. There has been significant loss (greater than 50%) of traditional buildings. Located within a loose farmstead cluster. Large modern sheds are located on the site.	ALTS - Significant Loss – more than 50% alteration
HB2: Clandon House, Thorpe in the Fallows	MLI118750	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard with multiple regular yards. The farmhouse is detached with the long axis facing on to the yard. There has been significant loss (greater than 50%) of traditional buildings. Located within a loose farmstead cluster. Large modern sheds are located on the site.	ALTS - Significant Loss – more than 50% alteration
HB3: The Grange, Thorpe in the Fallows	MLI118748	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard of E plan. The farmhouse is detached from the main working complex. There has been significant loss (greater than 50%) of traditional buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located to the side of the site.	ALTS - Significant Loss – more than 50% alteration
HB4: Stow Pasture, Stow	MLI116508	Extant 19th century farmstead. Loose courtyard with a single side of the courtyard formed by working agricultural buildings. The farmhouse is detached with the long axis facing	EXT –Extant – no apparent alteration

Receptor	HER ID	EH Farmsteads Project asset description	Survival
		on to the yard. Located within or in association with a hamlet. Large modern sheds are located to the side of the site.	
HB5: The Pastures, Stow	MLI116509	Extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard with L-plan range plus detached buildings to the third side of the yard. The farmhouse is detached from the main working complex. Located within or in association with a hamlet.	EXT - Extant – no apparent alteration
HB6: Cold Harbour, Cammeringham	MLI118742	Redeveloped 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard of U plan. The farmhouse is attached to a range of working buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located on the site.	DEM - Farmstead survives but complete alteration to plan
HB7: Blackthorn Hill, Cammeringham	MLI118739	Redeveloped 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard with multiple regular yards. The farmhouse is detached from the main working complex. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located to the side of the site.	DEM - Farmstead survives but complete alteration to plan
HB8: West Farm, Stow	MLI116506	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard with linked working buildings to all four sides of the yard. The farmhouse is detached with the gable end facing on to the yard. There has been a partial loss (less than 50%) of traditional buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located on the site.	ALT - Partial Loss – less than 50% change
HB9: East Farm, Stow	N/A	Extant 19th century unlisted farmstead. Regular courtyard with linked working buildings to all four sides of the yard. Prominent covered yard in association. The farmhouse	EXT - Extant – no apparent alteration

Receptor	HER ID	EH Farmsteads Project asset description	Survival
		location is unclear. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located on the site.	
HB10: Lowfield Farm, Willingham	MLI118118	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard of F plan. The farmhouse is attached to a range of working buildings. There has been significant loss (greater than 50%) of traditional buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located to the side of the site.	ALTS - Significant Loss – more than 50% alteration
HB11: Turpin Farm, Fillingham	MLI118047	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard of F plan. The farmhouse location is unclear. There has been a partial loss (less than 50%) of traditional buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located to the side of the site.	ALT - Partial Loss – less than 50% change
HB12: Side Farm, Fillingham	MLI118048	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard of E plan. The farmhouse is detached from the main working complex. There has been significant loss (greater than 50%) of traditional buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located to the side of the site.	ALTS - Significant Loss – more than 50% alteration
HB13: North Farm, Fillingham	MLI118049	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard of U plan. The farmhouse is detached from the main working complex. There has been significant loss (greater than 50%) of traditional buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located on the site.	ALTS - Significant Loss – more than 50% alteration

Receptor	HER ID	EH Farmsteads Project asset description	Survival
HB14: Unnamed farmstead, Fillingham	MLI118050	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard with multiple regular yards. The farmhouse is detached from the main working complex. There has been significant loss (greater than 50%) of traditional buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located on the site.	ALTS - Significant Loss – more than 50% alteration
HB15: Glebe Farm (Rectory Farm), Fillingham	MLI118051	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard with multiple regular yards. The farmhouse is detached from the main working complex. There has been a partial loss (less than 50%) of traditional buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located to the side of the site.	ALT - Partial Loss – less than 50% change
HB16: Fillingham Grange, Fillingham	MLI118052	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Loose courtyard with three sides of the courtyard formed by working agricultural buildings. The farmhouse is detached from the main working complex. There has been significant loss (greater than 50%) of traditional buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located to the side of the site.	ALTS - Significant Loss – more than 50% alteration
HB17: Unnamed farmstead, Fillingham	MLI118045	Extant 19th century outfarm. Single building. Isolated location.	EXT - Extant – no apparent alteration
HB18: Corringham Grange Farm, Corringham	MLI117364	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard with linked working buildings to all four sides of the yard. The farmhouse is detached from the main working complex. There has been a partial loss (less than 50%) of traditional	ALT - Partial Loss – less than 50% change

Receptor	HER ID	EH Farmsteads Project asset description	Survival
		buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located on the site.	
HB19: Glebe Farm, Blyton	MLI117413	Extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard with L-plan range plus detached buildings to the third side of the yard. The farmhouse is detached from the main working complex. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located to the side of the site.	EXT - Extant – no apparent alteration
HB20: Top Farm (Blyton Top), Blyton	MLI117414	Redeveloped 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard of L plan. The farmhouse is detached from the main working complex. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located to the side of the site.	DEM - Farmstead survives but complete alteration to plan
HB21: Grange Farm, Blyton	MLI117412	Redeveloped 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard with linked working buildings to all four sides of the yard. The farmhouse is attached to a range of working buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located on the site.	DEM - Farmstead survives but complete alteration to plan
HB22: Blyton Grange, Blyton	MLI117385	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard with linked working buildings to all four sides of the yard. The farmhouse is attached to a range of working buildings. There has been a partial loss (less than 50%) of traditional buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located to the side of the site.	ALT - Partial Loss – less than 50% change

Receptor	HER ID	EH Farmsteads Project asset description	Survival
HB23: Cold Harbour, Laughton	MLI117211	Partially extant 19th century farmstead. Regular courtyard of U plan. The farmhouse is attached to a range of working buildings. There has been significant loss (greater than 50%) of traditional buildings. Isolated location. Large modern sheds are located to the side of the site	ALTS - Significant Loss – more than 50% alteration

Appendix B

Residual effects following mitigation: Construction Phase

Heritage Receptor	Residual Effects	Level of harm
Scheduled Monuments		
Deserted village of Dunstall (NHLE 1004996)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Roman villa west of Scampton Cliff Farm (NHLE 1005041)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Southorpe medieval settlement (NHLE 1016794)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Gilby medieval settlement (NHLE 1016795)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Coates medieval settlement and moated site (NHLE 1016979)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Thorpe medieval settlement (NHLE 1016978)	Moderate Adverse	Less than substantial
Non-Designated Archaeological Remains		
AR10 (Site of demolished farmstead)	Slight Adverse	N/A
AR14 (Possible ditch and enclosure)	Neutral or Slight Adverse	N/A
AR18 (Normanby by Stow SMV)	Slight Adverse	N/A
AR22 (RB settlement)	Slight Adverse	N/A
AR22a (undated possible kiln)	Slight to Large Adverse	N/A
AR24 (RB settlement & Anglo-Saxon cemetery)	Large Adverse	N/A
AR25 (possible ditch)	Negligible Beneficial	N/A

Heritage Receptor	Residual Effects	Level of harm
AR32 (Possible ditches)	Neutral or Slight Adverse	N/A
AR44 (uncertain ditch)	Neutral or Slight Adverse	N/A
AR59 (IA/RB settlement)	Slight Adverse	N/A
AR61 (Post-medieval and RB ditches)	Neutral or Slight Adverse	N/A
AR63 (RB trackway)	Neutral or Slight Adverse	N/A
AR65 (Torksey Viking camp)	Neutral or Slight Adverse	N/A
AR67 (rectilinear enclosure?)	Neutral to Moderate Adverse	N/A
AR68 (possible pits and hollow)	Neutral to Moderate Adverse	N/A
AR69 (possible IA/RB settlement)	Slight to Moderate Adverse	N/A
AR70 (IA/RB field system)	Slight to Moderate Adverse	N/A
AR71 (RB field system)	Slight to Moderate Adverse	N/A
AR72 (RB trackway)	Slight to Moderate Adverse	N/A
AR73 (RB settlement)	Slight to Moderate Adverse	N/A
AR74 (possible RB ditches?)	Slight to Moderate Adverse	N/A
AR75 (possible IA/RB ditches?)	Slight to Moderate Adverse	N/A
Listed Buildings		
Glentworth Hall (NHLE 1063348)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Fillingham Castle (NHLE 1166045)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Former stables at Glentworth Hall (NHLE 1166094)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial

Heritage Receptor	Residual Effects	Level of harm
Thorpe in the Fallows Farmhouse (NHLE 1308921)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Mount Pleasant Farmhouse east of Laughton (NHLE 1317186)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Corringham Windmill (NHLE 1359417)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Non-Designated Historic Buildings		
HB3: The Grange, Thorpe in the Fallows	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB6: Cold Harbour, Cammeringham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB7: Blackthorn Hill, Cammeringham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB11: Turpin Farm, Fillingham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB12: Side Farm, Fillingham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB15: Glebe Farm (Rectory Farm), Fillingham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB18: Corringham Grange Farm, Corringham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB22: Blyton Grange, Blyton	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB23: Cold Harbour, Laughton	Slight Adverse	N/A
Registered Park and Garden		
Fillingham Castle (NHLE 1000977)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Non-Designated Historic Landscape		
HLI156 - Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20662 - Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20729 - Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A

Heritage Receptor	Residual Effects	Level of harm
HLI20674 - Ancient Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI21000 - Ancient Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20478 - Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20476 - Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20448 - Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI19277 - Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI19275 - Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI18970 - Private Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI18742 - Military Airfield	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20695 - Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20833 - Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20749 - Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20845 - Modern Fields	Option 2: Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20848 - Modern Fields	Option 2: Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20859 - Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Option 2: Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20861 - Modern Fields	Option 2: Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20951 - Modern Fields	Option 2: Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20892 - Parliamentary Planned Enclosure/Medium	Option 2: Slight Adverse	N/A
REGGEO - Regularly Laid Out Large Geometric Field Patterns	Option 2: Slight Adverse	N/A

Heritage Receptor	Residual Effects	Level of harm
REGGEO - Regularly Laid Out Large Geometric Field Patterns	Both Options: Slight Adverse	N/A
DESTROY - Modern Modified Field Patterns	Option 2: Slight Adverse	N/A
REFLOF - Field Patterns Reflective of Open Fields	Both Options: Slight Adverse	N/A
SEMIREG - Semi-Regular Field Patterns	Both Options: Slight Adverse	N/A
DESTROY - Modern Modified Field Patterns	Option 2: Slight Adverse	N/A

Residual effects following mitigation: Operational Phase

Heritage Receptor	Residual Effects	Level of harm
Scheduled Monuments		
Deserted village of Dunstall (NHLE 1004996)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Roman villa west of Scampton Cliff Farm (NHLE 1005041)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Southorpe medieval settlement (NHLE 1016794)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Thorpe medieval settlement (NHLE 1016978)	Moderate Adverse	Less than substantial
Non-Designated Archaeological Remains		
N/A	N/A	N/A
Listed Buildings		

Heritage Receptor	Residual Effects	Level of harm
Glentworth Hall (NHLE 1063348)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Fillingham Castle (NHLE 1166045)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Former stables at Glentworth Hall (NHLE 1166094)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Non-Designated Historic Buildings		
HB3: The Grange, Thorpe in the Fallows	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB6: Cold Harbour, Cammeringham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB7: Blackthorn Hill, Cammeringham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB8: West Farm, Stow	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB9: East Farm, Stow	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB11: Turpin Farm, Fillingham	Moderate Adverse	N/A
HB12: Side Farm, Fillingham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB13: North Farm, Fillingham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB18: Corringham Grange Farm, Corringham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB20: Top Farm (Blyton Top), Blyton	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB21: Grange Farm, Blyton	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB22: Blyton Grange, Blyton	Slight Adverse	N/A
Registered Park and Garden		
Fillingham Castle (NHLE 1000977)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Non-Designated Historic Landscape		

Heritage Receptor	Residual Effects	Level of harm
HLI20674 – Ancient Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20759 – Ancient Enclosure	Large Adverse	N/A
HLI20786 – Ancient Enclosure	Moderate Adverse	N/A
HLI21000 – Ancient Enclosure	Large Adverse	N/A
HLI21001 – Ancient Enclosure	Moderate Adverse	N/A
HLI145 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI146 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI148 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20658 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20659 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20661 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20662 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20752 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20758 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20774 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20785 – Modern Fields	Negligible Adverse	N/A
HLI21002 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI21026 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI108388 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A

Heritage Receptor	Residual Effects	Level of harm
HLI108389 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI142 – Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI144 – Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI156 – Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Moderate Adverse	N/A
HLI20729 – Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI20736 – Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Neutral	N/A
HLI20757 – Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI108394 – Private Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI108395 – Private Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI19285 – Ancient Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI19281 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI19282 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI19283 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI19276 – Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Moderate Adverse	N/A
HLI19277 – Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI19316 – Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI18742 – Military Airfield	Moderate Adverse	N/A
HLI18937 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI18961 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A

Heritage Receptor	Residual Effects	Level of harm
HLI18965 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI18969 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI19154 – Modern Fields	Slight Adverse	N/A
HLI1897 – Parliamentary Planned Enclosure	Slight Adverse	N/A

Residual cumulative effects following mitigation: Operational Phase

Heritage Receptor	Residual Effects	Level of harm
Scheduled Monuments		
Roman villa west of Scampton Cliff Farm (NHLE 1005041)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Listed Buildings		
Glentworth Hall (NHLE 1063348)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Fillingham Castle (NHLE 1166045)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Former stables at Glentworth Hall (NHLE 1166094)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Registered Park and Garden		
Fillingham Castle (NHLE 1000977)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial

Residual effects following mitigation: Decommissioning Phase

Heritage Receptor	Residual Effects	Level of harm
Scheduled Monuments		
Deserted village of Dunstall (NHLE 1004996)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Roman villa west of Scampton Cliff Farm (NHLE 1005041)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Southorpe medieval settlement (NHLE 1016794)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Thorpe medieval settlement (NHLE 1016978)	Moderate Adverse	Less than substantial
Listed Buildings		
Glentworth Hall (NHLE 1063348)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Fillingham Castle (NHLE 1166045)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Former stables at Glentworth Hall (NHLE 1166094)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial
Non-Designated Historic Buildings		
HB3: The Grange, Thorpe in the Fallows	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB6: Cold Harbour, Cammeringham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB7: Blackthorn Hill, Cammeringham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB8: West Farm, Stow	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB9: East Farm, Stow	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB11: Turpin Farm, Fillingham	Moderate Adverse	N/A

Heritage Receptor	Residual Effects	Level of harm
HB12: Side Farm, Fillingham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB13: North Farm, Fillingham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB18: Corringham Grange Farm, Corringham	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB20: Top Farm (Blyton Top), Blyton	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB21: Grange Farm, Blyton	Slight Adverse	N/A
HB22: Blyton Grange, Blyton	Slight Adverse	N/A
Registered Park and Garden		
Fillingham Castle (NHLE 1000977)	Slight Adverse	Less than substantial