

# Stonestreet Green Solar

## Environmental Statement

### Volume 4: Appendices

### Chapter 9: Biodiversity

### Appendix 9.2: Scoping Opinion Response

PINS Ref: EN010135

Doc Ref. 5.4

Version 1

June 2024

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009



## Table of Contents

1.1	Introduction	2
1.2	EIA Scoping Opinion Response	2

## List of Tables

Table 1.1:	EIA Scoping Responses (non-PINS)	2
------------	----------------------------------	---

# Appendix 9.2: Scoping Opinion Response

## 1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This **Appendix 9.2: Scoping Opinion Responses** has been prepared on behalf of EPL 001 Limited ('the Applicant') to respond to Scoping Opinion responses received by consultees other than PINS in relation to the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for Stonestreet Green Solar ('the Project'). Responses to Scoping Opinion comments made by PINS are provided in **Table 9.1 of ES Volume 2: Chapter 9: Biodiversity (Doc Ref. 5.2)**.

1.1.2 This is **Appendix 9.2 to ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Biodiversity (Doc Ref. 5.2)**.

## 1.2 EIA Scoping Opinion Response

1.2.1 **Table 1.1** provides the Scoping Report comments received by consultees (other than PINS) and how they have been responded to.

Table 1.1: EIA Scoping Responses (non-PINS)

Consultee and Comment	Response
<i>KCC Highways (18 May 2022)</i>	
To minimise this impact on ecology, the applicant may wish to carry out further Automatic Traffic Count ('ATC') surveys at access points to establish actual driven speeds which could justify lower visibility requirements and therefore less impact upon hedgerows that bound public roads.	An ATC survey has been completed as reported in <b>Section 13.5 'Baseline Conditions' of ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Access (Doc Ref. 5.2)</b> . The impact on hedgerows has been informed by this and has been minimised as far as possible.
<i>KCC Ecological Advice Service (EAS) (26 May and 13 June 2022)</i>	
Discussed the above written comments (supplied within the EIA Scoping Response (18th May 2022)) and confirmed that no significant (in consenting or legal terms) issues are anticipated. Discussed the detail and clarifications that will be provided in the ES to address these points, with agreement that this is a matter of setting out the basis for some conclusions, rather than any material concerns regarding the content of the ecological submission.  Habitat proposals were the main subject of discussion, with KCC EAS emphasising that	A virtual meeting was held between Lloydbore and KCC EAS on 26 May 2022.  The summary of the meeting held on the 26 May 2022 was provided to KCC EAS on the 13 June 2022. KCC EAS confirmed that the Lloydbore summary covered all matters discussed during the virtual meeting, with no further comments or response provided by KCC EAS.  As a precautionary approach, Folkestone to Etchinghill Escarpment SAC has been reincluded within the assessment and addressed in <b>Section 9.7 'Assessment of</b>

Consultee and Comment	Response
<p>habitat proposals need to be realistic and deliverable, and therefore ecologically viable.</p> <p>KCC EAS confirmed that they would want to see extensive and well-structured post-development ecological monitoring committed to in the ES submission, and that this monitoring provides a valuable opportunity to learn and share knowledge to help achieve better ecological outcomes on other solar projects.</p> <p>Basis for scoping out likely significant effects upon the Folkestone to Etchinghill Escarpment SAC explained by Lloydbore and confirmed that ES will include further explanation and evidence to support this conclusion, including AADT data.</p> <p>KCC satisfied that Lloydbore are covering all key matters, including through an extensive baseline survey programme, proactive consideration of the end habitat cover on site and maximising both the general biodiversity value of these habitats and their value for locally occurring legally protected and priority species.</p>	<p>Effects’ of this Chapter. The assessment within <b>Section 9.7</b> confirms no potential for significant effects on the Etchinghill Escarpment SAC.</p> <p>Habitat proposals as part of the landscape strategy and ecological monitoring are addressed in Section 9.6 ‘Embedded Design Mitigation’ of this Chapter.</p> <p>Habitat proposals as part of the landscape strategy and ecological monitoring are addressed in <b>Section 9.6</b> ‘Embedded Design Mitigation’ of <b>ES Volume 3, Chapter 9: Biodiversity (Doc Ref. 5.2)</b>.</p>
<p><i>Environment Agency (‘EA’) (18 May 2022)</i></p>	
<p>The EA will consider how the development will affect water biodiversity and the wetland environment, and that the South East River Basin Management Plan (‘RBMP’) states that the water environment should be protected and enhanced to prevent deterioration and promote the recovery of water bodies.</p> <p>The development must not have a negative effect on the river’s natural processes.</p> <p>NPPF [National Planning Policy Framework] biodiversity objectives and requirements identified.</p> <p>Survey and assessment information expectations identified: including a plan showing distances between development and the top of river bank, identification of ecological and hydro-morphological impacts</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 10.3: Water Framework Directive Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.4)</b> provides an assessment of the Project against the Water Framework Directive (‘WFD’) objectives including hydromorphological and ecological effects on the East Stour River.</p> <p>Survey and assessment information set out in the EA’s scoping response are provided in <b>Section 9.5</b> ‘Assessment of Effects’, <b>Section 9.6</b> ‘Embedded Mitigation Design’ and <b>Section 9.9</b> ‘Residual Effects’) of <b>ES Volume 3, Chapter 9: Biodiversity (Doc Ref. 5.2)</b>.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 3, Figure 9.5: East Stour River - Proximity Plans (Doc Ref. 5.3)</b> shows that a minimum 10m landscape buffer (as measured from the top of the</p>

Consultee and Comment	Response
and potential effects upon East Stour River, identification of important habitats, flora and fauna, an assessment of importance of important ecological features, assessment of impacts, mitigation measures and enhancement measures in relation to these features.	bank or channel edge) will be provided for the East Stour River or other identified watercourses. Any HDD cable drilling or temporary bridging structures will be installed following the granting of flood risk activity permits from the EA.