

# Springwell Solar Farm

## Environmental Statement

### Appendix 5.3 Scoping Opinion Response Matrix

Volume 3

EN010149/APP/6.3  
November 2024  
Springwell Energyfarm Ltd

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)  
Planning Act 2008  
Infrastructure Planning  
(Applications: Prescribed Forms  
and Procedure) Regulations 2009

## Table of Contents

<b>Scoping Opinion Response Matrix - PINS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Scoping Opinion Response Matrix - Statutory Consultees.....</b>	<b>75</b>

# Springwell Solar Farm

Environmental Statement

Appendix 5.3a: Scoping Opinion

Response Matrix - PINS



## EIA Scoping Opinion Response Matrix - PINS

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
<b>Description of the Proposed Development</b>				
2.1.1	Paragraph 2.1.2	Installation, construction and decommissioning methods	The Scoping Report states that the installation, construction and decommissioning methods to be utilised will be determined by the appointed contractor(s) while the EIA will represent a 'worst case'. The ES should set out the construction and design parameters and the works that will be involved for each of the three sites comprising the Proposed Development to ensure a clear understanding of assumptions and cumulative construction impacts to ensure that the worst-case construction scenarios are understood.	<p>A Rochdale Envelope approach within parameter ranges has been used for the purposes of the EIA. This approach has been taken to allow for flexibility to accommodate changes in technological advancements at the time of construction.</p> <p>Establishing the maximum parameters enables a robust and worst-case assessment of likely significant effects to be undertaken within the ES for environmental factors where the nature of the assessment requires a specific level of detail, such as maximum heights, massing, or noise levels. The assessment parameters that form the basis of the assessment are detailed in the works descriptions detailed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and presented in full in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Project Parameters [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. Further assumptions related to specific assessments can be found within the relevant technical chapters (<b>ES Volume 1, Chapters 6 to 15 [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>) The spatial extent of each Work No. to inform assessment is shown on the <b>Works Plans [EN010149/APP/2.3]</b>.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
2.1.2	Section 2.2	Flexibility	<p>The Inspectorate notes the Applicant's intention to apply a 'Rochdale Envelope' approach to maintain flexibility within the design of the Proposed Development, namely relating to the number of solar PV modules or construction methods. Scoping Report paragraph 2.2.7 also states that the design parameters will be further developed during statutory consultation. The Inspectorate expects that at the point an application is made, the description of the Proposed Development will be sufficiently detailed to include the design, size, capacity, technology, and locations of the different elements of the Proposed Development or where details are not yet known, will set out the assumptions applied to the assessment in relation to these aspects. This should include the footprint and heights of the structures (relevant to existing ground levels), as well as land-use requirements for all elements and phases of the development. The description should be supported (as necessary) by figures, cross-sections, and drawings which should be clearly and appropriately referenced. The Inspectorate considers that early refinement of options will support a more robust assessment of likely significant</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> provides a full description of the Proposed Development, alongside the design, size, capacity, technology and locations of the different elements of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Project parameters are detailed in full within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Project Parameters [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. The spatial extent of each Work No. to inform assessment is shown on the <b>Works Plans [EN010149/APP/2.3]</b>.</p> <p>The approach to flexibility and the principal assumptions that have been made are included in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The approach to flexibility and the reasonable worst-case scenario that has been assessed for each environmental factor are reported in each of the environmental factor chapters (<b>ES Volume 1, Chapters 6 to 15 [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>), supported by expert judgement where appropriate.</p> <p>Engagement on the design parameters was undertaken during Phase One and Phase Two consultation. Further engagement related to each environmental factor is detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapters 6 to 15 [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			effects and provide certainty to those likely to be affected. Where flexibility is sought, the ES should clearly set out and justify the maximum design parameters that would apply for each option assessed and how these have been used to inform an adequate assessment in the ES. The Inspectorate advises that each aspect chapter includes a section that outlines the relevant parameters / commitments that have informed the assessment.	
2.1.3	Paragraphs 2.5.9 and 2.5.10	Use of borrow pits	The ES should provide details regarding the consideration of the proposed borrow pit locations. The potential environmental impacts should be considered, including cumulative effects arising from the working and restoration and where significant effects are likely to occur.	Borrow pits are no longer proposed.
2.1.4	Paragraph 2.5.16	Habitat creation	Scoping Report paragraph 2.5.16 states that a programme of construction reinstatement and habitat creation will commence during the construction phase. The Inspectorate expects that these are included in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP). The description of habitat creation measures should include the location, extent, type of habitat creation, timeframe for establishment, ongoing	The programme of construction reinstatement and habitat creation is included in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> and the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> . This includes a description and objectives of habitat creation measures such as creation of calcareous grassland and neutral grassland meadow to maximise foraging, sheltering and breeding possibilities for a wide range of species, including

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
2.1.5	Section 2.7	Decommissioning	<p>maintenance requirements and any accompanying plans. Should habitat creation be included off-site, the area should be included in the red line boundary of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>farmland birds and brown hare. The location and type of habitat creation are detailed in the <b>Green Infrastructure Parameters [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> which forms Appendix 1 of the <b>oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>. Establishment and ongoing maintenance is detailed in Section 6 (Operational Management) of the <b>oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>. No off-site habitat creation is proposed.</p>
			<p>The ES should provide a description of the activities and works which are likely to be required during decommissioning of the Proposed Development, including the anticipated duration. Where significant effects are likely to occur as a result of decommissioning the Proposed Development, these should be described and assessed in the ES. Any proposals for restoration of the site to agricultural or other use should also be described.</p>	<p>Following the operational (including maintenance) phase, the Proposed Development will require decommissioning. Decommissioning is expected to take approximately 24 months and may be undertaken in phases. This would involve the removal of all of the Solar PV infrastructure, including the Ground Mounted Solar PV Generating Stations, Collector Compounds, Springwell Substation, BESS and ancillary infrastructure, including any on-site compounds. All concrete, hardstanding areas, foundations for the infrastructure and any internal tracks will be removed to a depth of up to 1m. All the below-ground cables will be left in situ.</p> <p>Decommissioning would include removing any permissive paths and the land will be returned to the landowner. Landscape structural planting, including tree planting, hedgerows, scrub, etc., created to deliver biodiversity mitigation and enhancement associated with the Proposed Development would be left in situ when the Site is</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
				<p>handed back to landowners, except for the planting within Tb2, which will be removed to facilitate the releveling and removal of the earth bund to allow the field to be returned to agricultural use. Otherwise, it is assumed that the landowner would return the land to agricultural use when it is handed back.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> provides further detail on the activities and works which are likely to be required during decommissioning.</p> <p>The Site will be reinstated in accordance with the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> which is submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application. Decommissioning is expected to take approximately 24 months and may be undertaken in phases. Activities are anticipated to be comparable, and no more impactful than those associated with construction. A Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will be subject to the approval of the local planning authorities at the time of decommissioning.</p> <p>The effects of the decommissioning phase are often similar to, or of a lesser magnitude than, the effects generated during the construction phase</p>



ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
<p>and have been considered in the relevant sections of the ES (<b>ES Volume 1, Chapters 6 to 15</b>) <b>[EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. However, there can be a high degree of uncertainty regarding decommissioning as engineering approaches and technologies will evolve over the operational life of the Proposed Development, and assumptions have therefore been made where appropriate.</p>				
<p><b>EIA Methodology and Scope of Assessment</b></p>				
2.2.1	Section 4.5	Baseline conditions	<p>It is noted that a number of surveys have been undertaken which have informed the Scoping Report however these have not been included or appended. Any information relied upon for the assessments in the ES should be appended to the ES in order for the Inspectorate to gain a full understanding of issues. The Applicant should ensure that surveys are up to date and adhere to current good practice.</p>	<p>The ES is supported by a number of figures and reports which have informed the assessments. Figures and appendices can be found within <b>ES Volume 2 [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b> and <b>ES Volume 3 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. All surveys are up to date and were carried out in line with current best practice.</p>
2.2.2	Section 4.8	Mitigation and monitoring	<p>The Scoping Report refers to several mitigation plans which will be provided with the application documents. The draft mitigation plans provided with the application should be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate how significant effects will be avoided or minimised and the ES should clearly demonstrate how the implementation of these plans will be</p>	<p>Mitigation measures are secured in a suite of outline management plans. The following outline management plans are submitted as part of the Development Consent Order Application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> - demonstrates how best practice measures will be implemented during construction of the Proposed Development. It also sets out</li> </ul>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>secured. Any measures identified to minimise likely significant effects should be consulted on with relevant consultation bodies. Mitigation measures should be clearly identified and justified in the ES with an explanation provided on how this mitigation would be secured through the Development Consent Order (DCO) process.</p>	<p>the monitoring activities designed to ensure that mitigation measures are carried out, and that they are effective;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> - details how operational best practice and mitigation measures will be implemented during the operation of the Proposed Development. It also sets out the monitoring activities designed to demonstrate that such mitigation measures are carried out, and that they are effective;</li> <li>• <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> - outlines how best practice mitigation measures will be implemented during decommissioning of the Proposed Development. It also sets out the monitoring activities designed to demonstrate that such mitigation measures are carried out, and that they are effective;</li> <li>• <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> - provides a framework for delivering the Green Infrastructure elements of the Proposed Development for the pre-construction and operational phase of the development including the successful establishment and future management of</li> </ul>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
				<p>the proposed landscape and ecological works for the duration of its operation. It sets out the short and long-term measures and practices that will be implemented by the Applicant to establish, monitor and manage landscape and ecology mitigation and enhancement (including biodiversity net gain and permissive paths) measures embedded in the design;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p><b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.8]</b> - provides mitigation for the traffic generated during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, including Heavy Goods Vehicles, in order to limit the impact on existing users of the public highway network, or those located close to it;</p> </li> <li> <p><b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b> - covers measures for soil handling, soil moisture content assessments and storage and trafficking of soils during the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development;</p> </li> <li> <p><b>Outline Public Right of Way and Permissive Path Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b> - demonstrate how the Public Right of Ways and permissive</p> </li> </ul>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
				<p>paths will be managed by the Applicant of the scheme to ensure they are safe and accessible; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.14]</b> - sets out the key fire safety provisions for the Battery Energy Storage System proposed to be installed at Springwell Solar Farm including measures to reduce fire risk and fire protection measures.</li> </ul> <p>Management plans include details of how any significant effects will be avoided and minimised. The ES clearly outlines how these plans are secured as part of the Development Consent Order Application.</p> <p>Mitigation measures identified to mitigate any likely significant effects have been consulted on with the relevant consultation body. Each of the ES technical chapters (<b>ES Volume 1, Chapters 6 to 15 [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>) includes a summary of the engagement undertaken to date, outlining how consultation has informed the assessment of effects. Details of consultation responses and how the Applicant has had regard to them are detailed in Appendix A-4, J-1, J-2 and K-3 of the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
2.2.3	Paragraph 2.4.61	Lighting	<p>The Report states that the National Grid Substation (NGS) compound, Project Substation compound, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) compounds, and Collector Compounds would include lighting, in accordance with relevant standards, but will not be permanently lit. External lighting should be assessed in a lighting assessment, for all elements and phases of the Proposed Development. It should be explained what measures are proposed to minimise light spill into the surrounding area and minimise impacts on sensitive human and ecological receptors.</p>	<p>There will be no permanent (continuous) lighting for security purposes except for at emergency exits as secured within the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>. Lighting sensors will be implemented around the Springwell Substation and BESS compound and CCTV system will include passive infra-red detectors around the Solar PV development to reduce the use of lighting and minimise light spill and any impacts to sensitive human and ecological receptors.</p> <p>It has been identified that lighting could cause disturbance to bats during construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning. Lighting has been considered within the ES, specifically within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity</b> and mitigation secured within the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>, <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> and <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b>.</p> <p>The <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> and <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> includes measures for the control of light during the construction and operation (including maintenance) phase respectively to ensure that effects are reduced (e.g. the use of lighting only when</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
2.2.4	Section 5.11	Transboundary	<p>The Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State (SoS) has considered the Proposed Development and concludes that the Proposed Development is unlikely to have a significant effect either alone or cumulatively on the environment in a European Economic Area State. In reaching this conclusion the Inspectorate has identified and considered the Proposed Development's likely impacts including consideration of potential pathways and the extent, magnitude, probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impacts.</p> <p>The Inspectorate considers that the likelihood of transboundary effects</p>	<p>necessary and directing lighting downward, away from boundaries and vegetation; CCTV infrared lighting and no permanent lighting at night). Further detail on the type of lighting will be provided in the Construction Environmental Management Plan and Operational Environmental Management Plan following detailed design.</p> <p>The <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP7.13]</b> identifies that decommissioning is to be undertaken in a sensitive manner and requires that any temporary lighting is operated in accordance with an agreed scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has noted this response and a detailed transboundary screening has not been undertaken.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
<p>resulting from the Proposed Development is so low that it does not warrant the issue of a detailed transboundary screening. However, this position will remain under review and will have regard to any new or materially different information coming to light which may alter that decision.</p>				
<p><b>Environmental aspects to be scoped out</b></p>				
2.3.1	Section 5.2	Glint and glare	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out a Glint and Glare ES aspect chapter, however a detailed stand-alone glint and glare assessment is proposed to be submitted in support of the DCO application. A description of any relevant mitigation measures and safety considerations will be included in the Proposed Development Chapter in the ES. The Inspectorate is content with this approach, however the stand-alone glint and glare assessment should be included as a technical appendix to the ES as well. The stand-alone glint and glare assessment should assess the worse-case scenario. In the event that glint and glare effects are identified, it should be used to inform the relevant chapters in the ES, in particular for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) aspect Chapter.</p>	<p>A stand-alone glint and glare assessment has been undertaken and is provided as a technical appendix to the ES within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. Mitigation measures including proposed landscape planting are detailed within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>, <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and secured within the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>.</p> <p>The glint and glare assessment has considered the worst case scenerio and maximum extent of Solar PV development within the Order Limits as presented and secured within the <b>Works Plans [EN010149/APP/2.3]</b>.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
2.3.2	Section 5.3	Heat and radiation	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of impacts from heat and radiation during construction, operation and decommissioning as no significant sources are anticipated. The Inspectorate draws the Applicant's attention to the response from Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council (Appendix 2) regarding heat and micro-climatic impacts. The agrees that this matter may be scoped out from further consideration, on the basis that the ES clearly signposts any identified sources of heat (and radiation), and how this has been considered with respect to site-selection, site layout, and mitigation design.</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines sources of heat and how this has influenced the design. This includes the spacing of BESS containers to avoid overheating, inclusion of Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems within each BESS unit and inclusion of a separation distance of 0.5m to 1m between cables within the trench to avoid overheating.</p> <p>There are no identified sources of radiation within the Proposed Development.</p>
2.3.3	Section 5.4	Major accidents and disasters	<p>A standalone Chapter for major accidents and disasters is not proposed on the basis that the nature, scale, and location of the Proposed Development is not considered to be vulnerable to or to give rise to significant impacts in relation to the risk of accidents and major disasters. Scoping Report Table 5-1 presents a list of possible major accidents and disasters that will require consideration including flooding, fire risk, aircraft disasters, rail accidents and plant disease. The Report</p>	<p>Consideration of the risks associated with major accidents and disasters have been included in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. Impacts of major accidents and disasters are considered within the <b>BESS Plume Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.19]</b> and <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, with any relevant mitigation measures secured within the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>, <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan</b></p>



ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>states that the above potential major accidents and disasters will be considered in the design of the Proposed Development and covered in the flood risk assessment, Battery Safety Commitments, glint and glare assessment and planting design and Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP). The Inspectorate has considered the characteristics of the Proposed Development and agrees with this approach. However, the ES should clearly signpost where these impacts are assessed in other relevant chapters and where any relevant mitigation measures are secured, if required.</p>	<p><b>[EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> and <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.14]</b> which are submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.</p>
2.3.4	Section 5.5	Utilities	<p>The Scoping Report suggests that existing infrastructure will be identified through consultation and a desk-based study and will inform the design and protective provisions to avoid impacts on receptors. The oCEMP will include any additional mitigation measures to protect against interference with below ground utilities during construction. The Inspectorate is content that a standalone ES Chapter for utilities is not required. However, the ES should explain the findings of the desk-based study and</p>	<p>A desk-based study of existing utilities within the Order Limits has been undertaken and is presented in <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 5.1: Desk-Based Study of Existing Utilities [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p>Engagement has been undertaken with relevant utilities providers and the Applicant would also expect to agree protective provisions with each utility owner, in order to ensure the DCO includes appropriate protections and restrictions on the Applicant's exercise of its powers, for the protection of utilities.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			signpost to where any required mitigation measures are secured.	<p>Relevant mitigation measures are secured within <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>, <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> and <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>
2.3.5	Section 5.6	Human Health	<p>The Scoping Report proposes that impacts to human health will be considered in other relevant Chapters including Air quality; Landscape and visual; Noise and vibration; Traffic and transport. Potential human health effects from glint and glare will be considered in the glint and glare assessment. The Inspectorate is content with this approach, however the ES should clearly set out potential impacts to human health from the Proposed Development during construction, operation and decommissioning and cross-reference where impacts are assessed within the ES; this may extend beyond the chapters proposed above, e.g. Land Contamination.</p>	<p>Consideration of impacts upon human health as a result of the Proposed Development are covered through the findings of other assessments undertaken as part of the EIA, such as air quality, landscape and visual, noise and vibration and traffic and transport.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality</b> (Section 6.9), <b>Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual</b> (Section 10.7), <b>Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration</b> (Section 12.9), <b>Chapter 13: Population</b> (Section 13.10), <b>Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport</b> (Section 14.10) <b>[EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> have considered the potential effects from the Proposed Development during construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning which relate to human health, as detailed below:</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines the potential impacts air quality and potential impacts on residents' wellbeing caused by respiratory conditions.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
				<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> considers the impacts on residential amenity and the users of PRow.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines the potential noise impacts, noting that these could have potential impacts on residents' wellbeing.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines the potential impacts to users of PRow and permissive paths which could have an impact on mental and physical health and wellbeing.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines potential impacts to amenity or safety (related to fear and intimidation on and by road users) and driver and passenger delay which could have health and wellbeing impacts.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> outlines potential impacts of glint and glare that could cause nuisance to people living in nearby residential properties.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
2.3.6	Section 5.7	Material assets	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to include a description of the potential streams and volumes of construction and operation materials within the Project Description chapter of the ES, in lieu of a standalone chapter. The Report proposes to manage impacts through a Materials Management Plan required through an oCEMP. Scoping Report paragraph 5.7.6 states that it is not intended to remove significant quantities of excavated arisings from the site during construction and that where possible, soil arisings will be balanced through a cut and fill exercise to retain volumes on site. However, there is no reference to the potential use of borrow pits. The Inspectorate agrees that this can be scoped out as a specific chapter of the ES; however, borrow pits should be considered within the ES Chapter on Land, soils and groundwater, and the ES Project Description should confirm the cut and fill balance.</p>	<p>Likely significant effects to human health are not expected as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The streams of construction materials and waste disposal are detailed in the <b>Outline Site Waste Management Plan</b> appended to the <b>oCEMP [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> with volumes of construction waste to be outlined in the Site Waste Management Plan, following detailed design.</p> <p>The potential service life of components is outlined within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. There will be relatively little waste produced during the operational (including maintenance) phase and the requirement for material assets will be limited to maintenance and replacement parts, as required.</p> <p>During decommissioning, the removal of any material assets and waste will be recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and market conditions at that time. If items can be recycled, this will be the first-choice option. The impacts of waste during the decommissioning phase will be managed and mitigated through measures documented within and secured by the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> and the <b>Outline Site Waste Management Plan</b></p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
				<p><b>[EN010149/APP/7.7].</b> The Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will be discussed and agreed with the host local planning authority with Lincolnshire County Council at the time of decommissioning to ensure any impacts on waste arising at this stage are considered and mitigated.</p> <p>The indirect impacts associated with materials consumption and waste disposal (e.g. release of greenhouse gas emissions, water consumption, amenity impacts, ecological impacts, etc) have been assessed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity, Chapter 8: Climate, Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport and Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1].</b></p> <p>It is also not intended that significant quantities of excavated arisings from the Site during construction (there are currently no demolition works proposed, for example), operation or decommissioning will be removed. There may, however, be a need to remove some soils from the Site for treatment or disposal, if found to be contaminated, as it is not practical to treat this on-Site. However, this is unlikely to be required. (refer to <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>). Where possible, soil arisings will be balanced through a cut and fill exercise to retain volumes on Site. The defined cut and fill balance for the Site will be</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
2.3.7	Section 5.7	Waste	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to include a description of the potential streams and volumes of construction and operational waste disposal within the ES Project Description chapter and manage impacts through an outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan, and a Site Waste Management Plan required through the oCEMP.</p> <p>There is no commitment to recycle solar panels at decommissioning. The ES should include an assessment of waste impacts for the decommissioning phase and include and outline what measures, if any, are in place to ensure that components (e.g. batteries and panels) are able to be diverted from the waste chain and managed in line with the waste hierarchy based on available technology at the time. The ES should also consider the requirement for cumulative impacts to be assessed at decommissioning due to</p>	<p>developed during detailed design. In Field Tb2, it is anticipated that any soil arisings from the re-leveling works will be repurposed for the creation of the earth bund.</p> <p>It should also be noted that borrow pits are no longer being considered as part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>During decommissioning, any material assets and waste will be removed and recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and all requirements in force at the time. If items can be recycled, this will be the first choice. The impacts of waste during the decommissioning phase will be managed and mitigated through measures documented within and secured by the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> which is associated to a Site Waste Management Plan which will be prepared as part of the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan prior to the decommissioning of the Proposed Development. The Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will be discussed and agreed with the relevant planning authority at the time of decommissioning to ensure any impacts on waste arising at this stage are considered and mitigated.</p> <p>The Applicant considers it not possible to assess all the inter-project cumulative effects of</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>a number of solar farms in the local area also likely to be decommissioning in a similar timescale.</p>	<p>decommissioning activities as there is currently no mechanism to identify other existing development and/or approved developments that would be relevant at that time. However, where possible, an assessment has been completed. It is anticipated that further consideration of the potential inter-project cumulative effects of decommissioning will be a matter for the relevant consenting authority at the time.</p>
2.3.8	Section 5.8	<p>Population - private property and housing, community, land and assets, and development land and businesses</p>	<p>The Inspectorate agrees with the proposal to scope out an assessment of impacts on private property and housing, community land and assets, and development land and businesses as the Scoping Report states there are none of these types of assets located within the site boundary.</p> <p>The ES should ensure however that the socio-economic effect of amenity impacts (e.g. visual impacts on tourism/recreational receptors, disruption/diversion of Public Rights of Way (PRoW)) is clearly addressed in other relevant chapters and mitigated through management plans.</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> assesses impacts to visual amenity as a result of the Proposed Development. This chapter includes mitigation measures to address impacts to visual amenity.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> addresses the socio-economic effects of the impacts to visual amenity, including effects on tourism and recreational receptors such as Public Rights of Way.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> addresses the temporary closures of the Public Right of Way that would be required to construct the Proposed Development. Mitigation measures are detailed within the <b>Outline Public Right of Way and Permissive Path Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b>.</p>
2.3.9	Section 5.8	<p>Population - agricultural land</p>	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out impacts to agricultural land holdings,</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> addresses socio-economic</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
		holdings/ socio-economic benefits	<p>considering that the loss of these agricultural operations is not expected to lead to a significant effect in relation to employment in the local area. Paragraph 5.8.19 of the Report anticipates various socio-economic benefits as a result of the Proposed Development and proposes to submit a Socio-Economic Benefits Statement with the DCO Application, separate from the ES, to highlight the positive impacts on the local and regional area.</p> <p>The Inspectorate considers that such an assessment should form part of a specific chapter of the ES which considers both the positive and negative socio-economic impacts of the development, including the cumulative loss of agricultural operations within the region.</p>	<p>impacts including economic benefit, effects on employment, agricultural land holdings and agricultural jobs. Therefore a socio-economic benefit statement is no longer being submitted as the required detail is included within Chapter 13. <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> assesses impacts associated with the cumulative loss of agricultural operations as a result of solar developments within the area.</p>
2.3.10	Section 5.8	Population - walkers, cyclists and horse riders	<p>There are a number of PRoW within the Site boundary some which would be temporarily diverted during the construction phase. The Applicant proposes to present these and detail relevant mitigation measures in a Public Rights of Way Commitments document, separate from the EIA process. The Inspectorate considers that surveys should be undertaken to provide baseline</p>	<p>The locations of Public Rights of Way are depicted in <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 2.2: Existing Public Rights of Way [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Public Right of Way and Permissive Path Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b> has been submitted in support of the Development Consent Order application. The plan includes a schedule of Public Rights of Way within the Site and outlines proposed measures to manage or</p>



ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>data in relation to the use of the PRowS affected by the Proposed Development and the ES should provide a figure clearly depicting the location of said PRowS. The ES should assess impacts to PRow and on walkers, cyclists and horse riders from the Proposed Development (and cumulatively with other developments) such as the need for temporary closures or diversions, or reduction in amenity, where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	<p>temporarily close Public Rights of Way within the study area during construction. The Public Rights of Way considered within the assessments was discussed with Lincolnshire County Council highways and Public Rights of Way officers and qualitative assessment and proposals were agreed exclusive of surveys, as a representative assessment considered the type of route in question across the Order Limits rather than number of users.</p> <p>For example, the Spires and Steeples Trail is a route of high local importance and as such, impact on users of this route could be more acutely felt than other outlier PRow within the Order Limits. The measures and proposals are outlined in the <b>Rights of Way and Streets and Access Plans [EN010149/APP/2.4]</b> and the <b>Outline Public Right of Way and Permissive Path Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b>.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> provides an assessment of effects on walkers, cyclists and horse riders as a result of temporary impacts to Public Rights of Way.</p>
2.3.11	Section 5.9	Water - flood risk	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out increases in flood risk during construction (paragraph 5.9.14), operation (paragraph 5.9.24) and</p>	<p>The drainage design and any associated mitigation measures have been agreed with the Environment Agency, Lincolnshire County Council and the Witham First Internal Drainage Board. Details of</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
2.3.12	Section 5.9	Water	<p>decommissioning (paragraph 5.9.31). However, a Flood Risk Assessment would be submitted with the application. Given the nature of the site and the development, and subject to ensuring no increase in flood risk and agreeing design and mitigation measures with Environment Agency, Lincolnshire County Council (the Lead Local Flood Authority) and the Witham First Internal Drainage Board, the Inspectorate is content to scope these matters out of the ES.</p>	<p>the further consultation is set out in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>A <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b> has been submitted as part of the Development Consent Order Application. The drainage design is provided within the <b>Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy</b> (which forms an appendix to the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b>). The drainage strategy demonstrates that surface water runoff from the Proposed Development can be managed effectively within the Site.</p>
			<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out the following from the ES, on the basis of drainage design and mitigation measures controlled through an oCEMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sedimentation and pollution of watercourses as a result of silt laden runoff arising from construction (paragraph 5.9.16)</li> <li>- water pollution as a result of chemical spillages during construction (paragraph 5.9.17) and operation (paragraph 5.9.25);</li> <li>- watercourse pollution as a result of cements and concretes being mobilised in surface water runoff (paragraph 5.9.18);</li> <li>- alterations in the surface water regime</li> </ul>	<p>Water quality has been assessed as part of <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, with mitigation measures for the protection of water quality outlined in this chapter. The chapter concludes that water quality during construction and decommissioning phases will be effectively protected by appropriate control measures and any adverse effects will be greatly reduced or eliminated. The protection of water quality will be focused on reducing the mobilisation of silt and pollutant chemicals from entering watercourses. Mitigation measures to protect water quality are documented within and will be secured by the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> and the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>during construction;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- increased foul flows to the foul sewers network during operation (paragraph 5.9.28);</li> <li>- disposal of contaminated water in the event of a BESS fire (paragraph 5.9.29);</li> <li>- increased demand for drinking water during operation (paragraph 5.9.30); and</li> <li>- impact of the decommissioning works on water quality (paragraph 5.9.31).</li> </ul> <p>The Inspectorate notes that impacts from herbicide and pesticide mobilisation have not been discussed in the Scoping Report and that horizontal directional drilling may be required but a breakout plan is not proposed. The Inspectorate does not consider enough evidence regarding the final design and control measures has been provided to scope impacts to water quality out during construction or decommissioning. The ES should identify relevant receptors and pathways of effect, the likely mitigation required to mitigate such effects and any monitoring required; this should include a drilling fluid breakout plan which should also be submitted with the Application if trenchless techniques are employed.</p>	<p>HDD Fluid Breakout Plan has been undertaken and forms Appendix 3 of the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
2.3.13	Section 5.9	Water resources	<p>The Scoping Report does not consider water resources although the site is located within an area of 'serious water stress' designated by the Environment Agency. The ES should provide details relating to water supply and demand requirements during construction and operation (including in the context of BESS fire risk) and water resources should be assessed in the ES where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	<p>Water resources have been assessed as part of <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The Site is identified as being within a 'water stress' area. During construction, there is likely to be increased demand on water resources temporarily. During the operational phase potable water demands will be limited to 24 staff daily. During the construction phase the demands for potable water will be higher temporarily due to increased numbers of construction staff, potable water will be supplied to the permanent welfare facilities from the Anglian Water mains supply and a bowser will be used to supply temporary welfare facilities. The current design allows for firewater storage tanks within the Site to cater for the BESS, if required then the firewater storage tanks would be likely filled with a bowser supply of non-potable water from offsite sources. The chapter outlines that there will be a preferred supply of non-potable water during the construction and operational phases to come from rainwater harvesting.</p>
2.3.14	Section 5.9	Water Framework Directive	<p>The Scoping Report identifies the potential for contamination of surface water and groundwater bodies. Given the geographic location of the Proposed Development, the ES should consider the potential impacts on Water Framework Directive (WFD) water bodies. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the</p>	<p>The WFD waterbodies within the Order Limits and study area have been identified as part of <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> as shown in <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 15.1: Watercourses and Water Receptors [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>. Metheringham Beck is the only WFD waterbody identified within the Order Limits and study area, and is located to</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>Inspectorate's Advice Note Eighteen: The WFD in this regard. The ES should explain the relationship between the Proposed Development and any relevant water bodies in relation to the current relevant River Basin Management Plan.</p>	<p>the north of the Site. This waterbody is classified with a moderate ecological status under the WFD/River Basin Management Plan (Cycle 3 – 2022). The chapter concludes that there will be no changes to Metheringham Beck as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Water quality protection measures and mitigation measures outlined in the chapter will protect Metheringham Beck from degradation for the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning phases. Mitigation measures to protect water quality are documented within and will be secured by the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>, the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> and the <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b>.</p>
2.3.15	Section 5.10	Electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields (EMF)	<p>The Applicant proposes to scope out EMF on the basis that the Proposed Development would not require cables and infrastructure exceeding 132kV; a threshold set out by Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) Power Lines: Demonstrating compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines, A Voluntary Code of Practice 2012 guidance. However, the project</p>	<p>The majority of underground cabling within the Site to facilitate the connection between the Solar PV modules, Balance of Solar System (BoSS), Satellite Collector Compound, BESS and Springwell Substation will be up to 132kV, apart from the short section of 400kV underground cabling which would connect the Springwell Substation to the National Grid Navenby Substation. <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.1: Scoping Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> proposed to scope</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>description at paragraph 2.4.1 of the Scoping Report includes “up to two new 400kV transmission towers to facilitate the electrical connection of the National Grid Substation to the existing 400kV transmission line”. It is also noted that the location of the proposed 400kV National Grid Substation compound has not yet been determined.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty surrounding the location of the substation and proximity to receptors, the ES should address the risks to human health arising from EMF to the extent that it is relevant to the nature of the development, taking into account relevant technical guidance, and where significant effects are likely to occur. The Inspectorate considers that the ES should demonstrate the design measures taken to avoid the potential for EMF effects on receptors from the substation infrastructure.</p>	<p>out EMF as at this time, all cabling was expected to be 132kV or below. This approach was agreed within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.2: Scoping Opinion [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. However, following the subsequent development of the design, it was determined that approximately 2.8km 400kV cable would be required to connect the Springwell Substation and National Grid Navenby Substation, which was consulted on during the phase two consultation (statutory consultation). The location of the Grid Connection Corridor is presented in <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 3.1: Zonal Masterplan [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has considered infrastructure constraints. The <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b> outlines how design has been embedded into the Proposed Development and considerations relevant to the location of the 400kV Grid Connection cable in relation to sensitive receptors.</p> <p>A standalone EMF study has been undertaken and is presented in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.5: High Level Electromagnetic Field Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> which sets out the proposed siting zone for the cabling and includes an assessment of EMF.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
<b>Air Quality</b>				
3.1.1	Paragraph 6.1.9	Site activities and road traffic exhaust emissions during operation	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out these matters given that the site activities and movement of vehicles during operation are expected to be minimal. On this basis, the Inspectorate agrees that these matters can be scoped out. The ES must however provide information on the nature of vehicle movements during the operational phases (alone and cumulatively) and confirm these projections fall below the relevant thresholds set out in guidance. The ES project description should also confirm that there are no emissions from operational plant that require further assessment.	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1] and ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> includes operational (including maintenance) phase (alone and cumulative) traffic data which has informed the air quality assessment provided in the <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.2: Air Quality Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development, there will only be limited movement of vehicles to the Site for operation and maintenance. A screening level assessment against the Environmental Protection UK-Institute of Air Quality Management 2017 guidance and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 Air Quality screening criteria has been undertaken and detailed within the <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.2: Air Quality Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> which confirms that there will not be any significant effect on air quality during operation. A screening level cumulative assessment against the Environmental Protection UK-Institute of Air Quality Management 2017 guidance and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 Air Quality screening criteria has</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
3.1.2	Paragraph 6.1.2	Study area - air quality	The Scoping Report states that the study area for sensitive ecological receptors will be up to 50m from the Site boundary or 50m from the edge of the roads. The ES should provide justification with reference to the relevant guidance for the study area for ecological receptors and agree with relevant consultation bodies.	<p>been undertaken and detailed within the <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.4]</b> and <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.2: Air Quality Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> which confirms that the cumulative operational traffic flows fall below the relevant screening criteria and therefore, the cumulative operational phase effect is considered not significant.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> has confirmed that there are no emissions from operational plant that require further assessment.</p>
3.1.3	Paragraph 6.1.11	Demolition	Scoping Report paragraph 6.1.11 refers to four sources of potential dust and particulate matter effects but only lists three: earthworks; general site activities; and trackout. Demolition is not scoped in. Given that there are no demolition works proposed during construction, the	Construction activities and the operation of equipment during construction and decommissioning will result in dust and exhaust gases emissions to the atmosphere. Demolition activities during construction will result in dust and exhaust gases emissions to the atmosphere. A dust risk assessment for the demolition activities



ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			Inspectorate agrees that this can be scoped out during construction, however, should the decommissioning phase entail demolition works then these should be assessed, where significant effects are likely to occur.	during the construction phase has been undertaken and presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> with the approach detailed within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.2: Air Quality Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> . North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council have been consulted regarding the changes on the scope of the dust risk assessment. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.1: Air Quality Stakeholder Engagement Activities [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> .
3.1.4	N/A	Air quality	The ES should be accompanied by a plan showing the location of sensitive air quality receptors within the vicinity of the Proposed Development to aid understanding of the extent of effects.	A plan showing the location of the sensitive air quality receptors has been prepared and included within <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 6.4: Location of Sensitive Air Quality Receptors [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b> .
<b>Biodiversity</b>				
3.2.1	Paragraph 6.2.9	Internationally and nationally statutory designated sites (all phases)	The Scoping Report seeks to scope out these receptors on the grounds that there are no internationally protected nature conservation sites within 10km of the Site and no nationally protected statutory designated nature conservation sites within 2km of the Site. The Inspectorate agrees that the proposal is unlikely to adversely impact any European or internationally designated nature	Noted.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>conservation sites or nationally designated sites and this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	
3.2.2	Paragraph 6.2.9	Local wildlife sites	<p>The Scoping Report states that these sites would be avoided by the current Proposed Development design minimum offset distance of 15m from LWSs and they would also be protected by the oCEMP. It is not possible to locate these LWSs on the Environmental Features Plan in Appendix C of the Scoping Report as it is not accompanied with a schedule of sites. No site layout options have been presented and as such it is not confirmed that impacts have been avoided. The ES should consider any impacts upon local wildlife and geological sites, including local nature reserves with reference to the reasons for designation, and the findings of other impact assessment disciplines (noise, air quality, water resources). The ES should clearly present the location of LWSs and how they interact with the Proposed Development. The assessment of potential direct and indirect effects on LWSs needs to be made.</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 2, Figure 7.1: Location of Local Wildlife sites and Area Proposed for Vegetation Removal [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b> illustrates the location of the LWS's and how they interact with the Proposed Development. Built development above ground will be offset at least 20m from Local Wildlife Sites except for highways improvement works which is secured in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>.</p> <p>LWSs were originally scoped out however the design has since been updated and four LWSs are now considered likely to be directly affected by vegetation removal required to facilitate highways access. The assessment of potential direct and indirect effects on LWSs is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and supported by the <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9: LWS Verges Survey EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. LWSs have been also assessed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> which confirms that there would be no significant effects. Designated ecological sites have been scoped out from the noise and vibration assessment however best practice mitigation measures for noise, air quality and water resources to prevent any impacts to the</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
				LWSs are detailed within the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> and the <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> .
3.2.3	Paragraph 6.2.9	Local wildlife sites	The Scoping Report seeks to scope these receptors out due to the distance from the Site and a lack of relevant links or impact pathways. The Scoping Report has not supported this with evidence regarding the sites and impact pathways, in light of this the Inspectorate is unable to scope these receptors out at this stage.	<p><b>ES Volume 2, Figure 7.1: Location of Local Wildlife sites and Area Proposed for Vegetation Removal [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b> illustrates the location of the LWS's and how they interact with the Proposed Development. Built development above ground will be offset at least 20m from Local Wildlife Sites except for highways improvement works which is secured in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>.</p> <p>LWSs were originally scoped out however the design has since been updated and four LWSs are now considered likely to be directly affected by vegetation removal required to facilitate highways access. The assessment of potential direct and indirect effects on LWSs is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and supported by the <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.9: LWS Verges Survey EN010149/APP/6.3</b>.</p>
3.2.4	Paragraph 6.2.9	Lowland Meadow Priority Habitat (all phases)	The Scoping Report proposes to avoid the grassland parcels assessed as priority habitat. Lowland meadow by design and protect them through the oCEMP.	The UKHab Survey Results in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> shows no lowland meadow priority grassland habitat within the Order Limits

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
3.2.5	Paragraph 6.2.9	Hedgerows and hedgerow trees (all phases)	<p>No site layout options have been presented and as such it is not confirmed that impacts have been avoided. The Inspectorate is unable to agree to scope this receptor out at this stage.</p>	<p>(only LWS calcareous grassland has been identified within the Order Limits).</p>
			<p>The Scoping Report states that the Proposed Development would be designed to include a buffer from panels to boundary features including hedgerows and trees and measures in the oCEMP would safeguard their protection. It also states that mitigation for any habitat loss will be included in the oLEMP. A commitment to provide habitat mitigation/compensation cannot be relied upon to scope habitats out. An assessment should identify the relative nature conservation value of receptors, any impact pathways, the extent and significance of effects, and should demonstrate that the mitigation hierarchy has been applied. The Inspectorate is unable to agree to scope this receptor out at this stage.</p>	<p>Hedgerows and trees were initially proposed to be scoped out as the design aims to retain and protect hedgerows and trees, where possible. However, several sections of hedgerow will need to be removed for installation of cable, highways access and internal access roads. The hedgerows affected have been scoped in. Surveys of these hedgerows have been carried out- to assess their value using the ecological criteria for 'Important Hedgerows' which has been documented in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.11: Important Hedgerow Survey [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> During the development of the design, the mitigation hierarchy was implemented for the areas of hedgerow removal alongside the consideration of other environmental factors.</p> <p>Hedgerows affected by the Proposed Development have been assessed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p>The location of proposed vegetation removal is presented in <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 3.11: Vegetation Removal Parameters [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>, <b>Figure 7.4: Important</b></p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
<p><b>Hedgerow Surveys and Areas Proposed for Vegetation Removal [EN010149/APP/6.2].</b></p> <p>Although c.1,249m of hedgerows are proposed to be lost during construction, these hedgerows would be re-instated, where possible, after construction or planted elsewhere. New tree and hedgerow planting is detailed in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9].</b></p>				
3.2.6	Paragraph 6.2.9	Ponds (all phases)	<p>The Scoping Report states that no ponds would be lost to the Proposed Development and the implementation of the oCEMP would include standard practice pollution prevention measures. No site layout options have been presented and as such it is not confirmed that impacts have been avoided. No detail has been provided regarding the proposed mitigation measures. Insufficient information has been provided to enable the Inspectorate to scope out ponds at this stage.</p>	<p>All suitable ponds within at least 100m of the Order Limits have been eDNA surveyed and GCN are considered likely absent. Due to the negative results of ponds surveyed it is considered that GCN are unlikely to be present on Site.</p> <p>All ponds within the Order Limits and up to 500m of the Order Limits were tested for great crested newt eDNA. Details of the surveys are provided in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b></p> <p><b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> outlines mitigation measures, including the installation of temporary bunding and/or settlement ponds to isolate and treat any sediment-laden or contaminated water onsite before discharging it into the drainage system..</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
3.2.7	Paragraph 6.2.9	Semi-improved grassland (all phases)	<p>The Scoping Report states that the oLEMP would include measures to sufficiently compensate for habitat loss and to protect any retained areas of this habitat during construction.</p> <p>A commitment to provide habitat mitigation/compensation cannot be relied upon to scope habitats out. An assessment should identify the relative nature conservation value and apply the mitigation hierarchy. The Inspectorate is unable to agree to scope this receptor out at this stage.</p>	<p>Habitat losses are quantified in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.14: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>The embedded mitigation to compensate for habitat loss will be the creation of c.100ha of calcareous or neutral grassland managed for the benefit of ground nesting and wintering birds, which will be in key open and connected areas. The area of land set aside for embedded mitigation is smaller than the area which would be developed. However, the proposed area and retained areas for habitat creation and improvement have been estimated as sufficient to support the number of territories that would be lost, by increasing the carrying capacity and quality of nesting and foraging habitat for ground nesting birds.</p> <p>As well as embedded mitigation to compensate for habitat loss, there will also be improvement measures to increase both invertebrate and seed biomass for foraging ground and other bird species.</p> <p>Further information related to habitat loss can be found in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b></p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
3.2.8	Paragraph 6.2.9	Invasive species (all phases)	<p>The Scoping Report seeks to scope out this receptor as no invasive species were identified during the Preliminary Ecological survey and that if any are found during further survey, then an invasive species method statement would be implemented to prevent the spread of this species during construction.</p> <p>The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out if no invasive species are identified. Should invasive species be identified during further survey work, an assessment of the effects arising from the spread of invasive species during construction and decommissioning should be included within the ES and biosecurity measures incorporated into the oCEMP where necessary.</p>	<p>No invasive species have been found on Site during surveys. However, consideration of potential for invasive species is discussed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and biosecurity measures are incorporated into the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> where necessary.</p>
3.2.9	Paragraph 6.2.9	Invertebrates (all phases)	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out invertebrates due to a lack of records of protected species and a lack of high-quality habitat within the Site that could support an important invertebrate assemblage. The Inspectorate notes that the fields at the northern and southern edges of Springwell West have not been surveyed. This matter can be scoped out if the Applicant can demonstrate that no protected species or high-quality habitat</p>	<p>No protected invertebrate species nor high-quality invertebrate habitat has been observed following completion of the PEA surveys (including fields at the northern and southern edges of Springwell West). Consequently in agreement with relevant consultees invertebrates remain scoped out. Detailed information is within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			are observed following completion of the surveys, with agreement from the relevant consultees.	Further information related to consultation can be found within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .
3.2.10	Paragraph 6.2.9	Reptiles (all phases)	<p>The Scoping Report argues that the majority of the site is unsuitable for reptiles and seeks to scope them out on this basis. It suggests that precautionary measures would be detailed in the oCEMP to safeguard low numbers of reptiles that may be present in semi-improved grassland areas.</p> <p>The Inspectorate considers that further reptile surveys should be undertaken but restricted to the areas of suitable habitat identified in the PEA.</p>	<p>As the areas considered potentially suitable for reptiles are excluded from development, therefore, no reptile surveys were proposed. This approach was discussed and agreed with North Kesteven District Council. Figure 4: UK Hab Plan of <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> shows habitat types which are referred to in the PEA report /target notes and outlines the areas suitable for reptiles. Precautionary measures are detailed in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> and <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> to safeguard low numbers of reptiles that may be present.</p>
3.2.11	Paragraph 6.2.9	Non-ground nesting birds (all phases)	<p>The Scoping Report argues that through the retention of boundary hedgerows and trees and implementation of precautionary measures detailed in an oCEMP, nests would be safeguarded during construction. The Scoping Report does not anticipate any effects during</p>	<p>Other non-ground nesting birds have been scoped out from the ES assessment.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 2, Figures 3.3A - 3.3F: Green Infrastructure Parameter Plans [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b> are presented in the ES showing buffer zones between hedgerows and</p>



ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>operation and does not mention decommissioning.</p> <p>No site layout options have been presented and as such it is not confirmed that habitats will be retained. No detail has been provided regarding the proposed precautionary mitigation measures.</p> <p>Insufficient information has been provided at this stage to enable the Inspectorate to scope out this matter.</p>	<p>trees and the Proposed Development as part of the embedded design.</p> <p>Hedgerows will be enhanced and 10m buffers from built development will sufficiently safeguard non-ground nesting birds during construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning, as detailed in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b> and protection of hedgerows, such as best practice pollution control measures, will be secured through the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> and <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b></p> <p>The 10m buffer protection of hedgerows and hedgerow trees would be maintained throughout operation and no significant disturbance effects are anticipated.</p> <p>Measures to improve hedgerows and field margins for non-ground nesting birds are documented within and secured by the <b>oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>.</p>
3.2.12	Paragraph 6.2.9	Wintering birds (all phases)	The Scoping Report states that the site is not considered of importance for overwintering waders and wildfowl due to distance from coast and any significant	The initial PEA survey in 2022 did not consider the Site to be likely of importance for a significant assemblage of wintering birds. However, following advice from North Kesteven District Council, wintering bird surveys were carried out. Although

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>wetland areas (i.e. it is more than 35 km from the Wash Special Protection Area). The Inspectorate agrees that the site is not likely to represent functionally linked habitat to any European sites, nevertheless the site could still have value for wintering birds and impacts could arise from the substantive land use change for the proposed development; therefore this matter should be scoped in.</p>	<p>the Site was not found to be functionally linked to any European sites, it was considered to be of up to District importance for wintering birds. The PEA report has since been updated (shown in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>). Results from the wintering bird surveys are shown in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.3: Wintering Bird Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>Wintering birds have therefore been scoped in and the potential effects on wintering birds are presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
3.2.13	Paragraph 6.2.9	Barn owl (all phases) Marsh harrier (all phases)	<p>The Scoping Report states that disturbance arising from construction and decommissioning to these species would be mitigated by buffer zones and measures detailed within the oCEMP and oLEMP, and any loss of foraging habitat would be mitigated through habitat creation and enhancement secured through the oLEMP. The Scoping Report does not anticipate any significant effects to these species during operation.</p> <p>A commitment to provide habitat mitigation/compensation cannot be relied upon to scope habitats out. The ES should assess impacts on these species</p>	<p>Barn owl have been identified as nesting adjacent to the Site as well as using the Site for foraging and roosting. Barn owl have been scoped into the assessment. The potential effects on barn owls during construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning are presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>No marsh harrier were found to be nesting although they were seen occasionally foraging across the Site. There is not anticipated to be a loss of foraging habitat as a result of the Proposed Development as marsh harriers mostly hunt along field margins which will be maintained and improved, therefore marsh harrier has been</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>during construction and decommissioning as well as operation and this should include impacts from habitat loss, disturbance and lighting.</p>	<p>scoped out of the ES assessment. This is documented within and secured by the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>, <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>, and <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b>.</p>
3.2.14	Paragraph 6.2.9	<p>Water vole (all phases)  Otter (all phases)  European eel (all phases)</p>	<p>The Scoping Report states that no ponds or watercourses will be lost to the Proposed Development but where small sections of watercourses may be affected, 'standard mitigation' and pollution prevention measures (secured with the oCEMP) would be implemented.</p> <p>Given the potential for watercourses to be affected, and the lack of detail regarding the proposed mitigation measures, the Inspectorate is unable to scope these species out at this time.</p>	<p>All ponds will be retained and protected. There will be a 6m buffer from watercourses and mitigation measures to protect aquatic habitats, as secured in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>. Mitigation measures to protect watercourses are documented within and secured by the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> and the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p> <p>The updated design has shown that six ditches will be affected by internal road crossings. An aquatic habitat assessment and riparian mammal survey of these six ditches was carried out in 2024 (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.7: Riparian Mammal and Aquatic Habitat Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>). They were found to be dry and it was determined that aquatic species and riparian mammals are unlikely to be affected by works. Riparian mammals and fish (including eel) therefore remain scoped out.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
3.2.15	Paragraph 6.2.9	Badger (all phases)	<p>The Scoping Report states that all known setts would be retained with an appropriate buffer and implementation of precautionary measures detailed in an oCEMP would mitigate for any residual risk. No site layout options have been presented and as such it is not confirmed that habitats will be retained. No detail has been provided regarding the proposed precautionary mitigation measures. Insufficient information has been provided at this stage to enable the Inspectorate to scope out this matter.</p>	<p>Badgers have been scoped out of the assessment. All known badger (<i>Meles meles</i>) setts will be retained with an appropriate buffer (i.e. 30m buffer from main badger setts) to avoid disturbance or damage to setts. Field margins will remain as open corridors for animals to disperse and mammal gates will be installed within fences to allow badgers access into fields for foraging, as secured in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>. As badgers are highly mobile, further surveys would be carried out prior to construction and decommissioning as required.</p> <p>Mitigation measures to ensure safeguarding badgers and their setts, such as ensuring any open excavations are covered overnight or ramps installed should animals fall in, are documented within and secured by the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> and <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p> <p>As badgers are highly mobile updated badger surveys will be carried out within six months prior to any works as secured in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>.</p> <p>Further information related to badger surveys is found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.10: Badger</b></p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
				<b>Survey Report - Confidential [EN010149/APP/6.3]).</b>
3.2.16	Paragraph 6.2.9	Deer and other mammals (all phases)	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out the impact of fencing on foraging and dispersal for deer and other unspecified mammals on the grounds that the fencing will be designed to be 'semi-permeable' allowing movement across the site. The Inspectorate agrees that no likely significant effects are anticipated for deer and therefore an assessment can be scoped out of the ES. The application should provide further details regarding fencing design.	<p>The fields encompassing the Solar PV modules and supporting infrastructure will likely be fenced using 'deer-proof fencing'. Access gates will be metal and of similar height as the perimeter fencing. Clearances above ground, or mammal gates, will be included to permit the passage of wildlife.</p> <p>Further details regarding fencing design are presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. Mitigation to maintain access for dispersal and foraging mammals is detailed in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>.</p>
3.2.17	Paragraph 6.2.7	Impact pathways	Scoping Report paragraph 6.2.7 refers to habitat loss/ degradation but fails to describe any other impact pathways (e.g. disturbance, lighting, habitat fragmentation/ severance, collision risk). The Proposed Development would entail a range of activities with the potential to generate ecological impacts. The ES Ecology chapter should consider all potential impact pathways and assess any impacts arising from the Proposed Development which are likely to result in significant effects on ecological receptors.	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> considers all potential impact pathways and assesses any impacts arising from the Proposed Development which are likely to result in significant effects on ecological receptors. Full justification for scoping out any ecological impact is provided in the Biodiversity Chapter.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			Justification for scoping out any ecological impact should be provided.	
3.2.18	n/a	Plants, veteran and ancient trees	<p>Notable flora is not specifically addressed within the survey scope. Consideration should be given to scarce arable flora that could occur in arable fields and be adversely affected by changes in land use. There is no information on veteran and ancient trees in the Scoping Report. The ES should identify any veteran trees and assess any significant effects on these receptors where they are likely to occur and propose adequate mitigation where identified.</p>	<p>One veteran tree has been identified in a hedgerow within the Order Limits, which is over 250m from proposed built development so is unlikely to be affected by works and has therefore been scoped out. Hedgerows and trees have been protected in the embedded design by suitable buffers. <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> includes mitigation measures related to biodiversity embedded into the design of the Proposed Development. These measures are secured within the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures to retain and protect trees are detailed in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> and <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p> <p>Notable arable plant surveys were carried out in 2024 (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.8: Arable Flora Survey [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>). They were found to be of County importance and have been scoped into the ES assessment. The potential effects on notable arable plants during construction, operation (including maintenance) and</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
3.2.19	n/a	Brown hare, hedgehog	Scoping Report paragraph 6.2.5 notes the presence of brown hare and hedgehog in the study area but these have not been proposed to be scoped into the assessment. The ES should consider effects on these species and be supported by robust survey data, unless otherwise agreed with relevant consultation bodies.	<p>decommissioning are presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Brown hare and hedgehog have been scoped out as agreed with North Kesteven District Council. Field margins will remain as open corridors for animals to disperse across the Site and they would have access into fields for foraging. This is secured in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are documented within and secured by the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>, <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>, <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> and <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>
<b>Climate</b>				
3.3.1	Paragraph 6.3.9	Climate resilience during construction, operation and decommissioning – flooding	Scoping Report Table 5-1 states that the majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 1 and the vulnerability of the Proposed Development to flooding will be covered in the Flood Risk Assessment appended to the ES. On this basis, the Inspectorate agrees that significant effects are not likely to occur and an	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Although significant flood risk effects are unlikely, the Solar PV module design accounts for resilience by setting a maximum height of 3.0 meters above ground level (AGL) for most areas. In designated flood-risk areas, the maximum height will be up to</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			assessment of resilience to flooding can be scoped out of the Climate chapter of the ES. The Inspectorate agrees that given the distance of the site to the coastline, sea-level rise is not a relevant consideration.	3.5 meters AGL to ensure adequate freeboard and climate resilience.
3.3.2	Paragraph 6.3.9	Climate resilience during construction, operation and decommissioning – high heat, wind speeds	The Inspectorate agrees that this can be scoped out of the assessment on the basis of embedded resilience of solar PV modules to high heat and wind speeds. However, the ES project description should explain how the development has been designed to be resilient to such effects.	Noted. <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> includes further details on the embedded climate resilience of Solar PV modules.
3.3.3	n/a	In-combination Climate Change Impact (ICCI) Assessment	The Scoping Report has not proposed to scope in/out an ICCI assessment. Solar panels have potential to alter precipitation runoff rates and patterns. In light of this, and in the absence of more detailed information regarding drainage design and controls, the Inspectorate considers that the ES should consider effects arising from a change in precipitation as a result of climate change in-combination with the scheme, where significant effects are likely to occur.	A preliminary in-combination assessment has been undertaken to assess the impact of precipitation change on run off rates and patterns as part of <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> . This assessment indicates that total annual precipitation in the East Midlands area is expected to increase in the short term (2020 – 2039) and decrease in the longer term (2040 – 2059); however, summer rainfall is expected to decrease and winter rainfall is expected to increase across both time frames. The range of probabilities is highly variable. The frequency and magnitude of extreme precipitation events is predicted to increase due to climate change.



ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
				An <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> has been prepared and sits as an appendix to the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b> .
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>				
3.4.1	Paragraph 6.4.9	Setting effects on all heritage assets within the study area (construction)	The Scoping Report argues that the construction phase effects resulting from changes in the setting of heritage assets will be temporary and no worse than the operational phase effects, therefore, it is not considered necessary to repeat the settings assessment for the construction phase. Given that setting can be negatively affected through more than simply visual effects (e.g. noise, dust) the Inspectorate does not agree with the assumption that the construction phase effects would be no worse than the operational phase effects and therefore does not agree to scope out this phase.	The Applicant notes that construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning activity in proximity to heritage assets could result in a loss of the setting quality of "tranquillity" through increased noise; and has potential to result in dust which might affect the fabric of built heritage assets. Significant effects could occur without mitigation. This matter has been scoped in and has been assessed as detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .
3.4.2	Paragraph 6.4.9	Impacts on the setting of listed dwellings within settlements over 1km from the Site (operation)	The impacts on setting to these receptors are proposed to be scoped out on the basis that the positive contribution made by setting to the significance of residential listed buildings within settlements is typically confined to their immediate street scene. The Scoping Report does not justify why and how the 1km reference has been derived. The Inspectorate considers there is	<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> has used a study area of 2km from the Site for non-designated assets and 5km from the Site for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance. Assets identified in the stage 1 setting assessment as being sensitive to changes in their setting have been filtered and assessed based on a worst case ZTV for the Proposed Development.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			insufficient evidence provided to scope out this matter at this stage.	Heritage assets outside the ZTV have been scoped out on the basis that no physical impacts are predicted as these assets are outside the Site. Potential physical impacts as a result of construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning traffic would be avoided through standard traffic control measures set out in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> , <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> and <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> .
3.4.3	Paragraph 6.4.9	Listed K6 telephone kiosks (operation)	These receptors are proposed to be scoped out on the grounds that their surroundings make a neutral contribution to their significance as they are found in a variety of contexts throughout the UK. The Inspectorate agrees that significant effects on such assets are unlikely to arise and this matter can therefore be scoped out of the ES.	Noted.
3.4.4	Paragraph 6.4.9	Various findspots recorded by LCC HER (listed in Scoping Report) (construction and operation)	The Scoping Report explains that as findspots, these have been removed from the Site and the heritage significance of their former locations would not be harmed by the Proposed Development. The Inspectorate agrees that the findspots can be scoped out of the ES.	Noted.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
3.4.5	Paragraph 6.4.9	Milepost 20 metres south of Ashby Lodge Farm (Grade II Listed) (operation)	The Scoping Report argues that the positive contribution made by setting to the significance of the milepost derives from its relationship with the road network, and this would not be altered by the Proposed Development during operation. The Inspectorate agrees on this basis that this asset can be scoped out of this phase.	Noted. The potential for unintended impacts during construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning has been identified and this asset has been scoped in for these effects (but remains scoped out for effects resulting from changes in its setting) as detailed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .
3.4.6	Paragraph 6.4.9	Avro Lancaster crash site (operation)	This receptor is proposed to be scoped out on the basis that its significance does not draw on its wider surroundings. The Inspectorate agrees this asset can be scoped of the operational assessment.	Noted.
3.4.7	Paragraph 6.4.9	Hawker Hurricane crash site (operation)	This receptor is proposed to be scoped out on the basis that its significance does not draw on its wider surroundings. The Inspectorate agrees this asset can be scoped of the operational assessment.	Noted.
3.4.8	Paragraph 6.4.9	Sites of former extractive pits in Ashby de la Launde and Bloxholm, and Rowston (construction and operation)	These receptors are proposed to be scoped out on the grounds that they have negligible importance and significant effects upon them are therefore unlikely. The Scoping Report has provided no justification/evidence to support its assessment of 'negligible importance' and therefore the Inspectorate is unable to scope this matter out at this stage.	<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> provides the justification for scoping out these assets. As post-medieval extractive pits (quarrying) their heritage significance is negligible.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
3.4.9	Paragraph 6.4.9	All heritage assets within the study area during decommissioning	<p>The Scoping Report seeks to scope out the decommissioning phase on the basis that it would not result in impacts to any additional heritage assets not affected during construction and operation, and changes in the setting of heritage assets in the surrounding area will be no worse than the construction or operational phase effects.</p> <p>The Inspectorate considers that there is potential for decommissioning stage effects on buried archaeological resource, such as the potential for harm due to compaction, removal of piles, and subsequent potential changes in drainage patterns. In addition, given that the potential effects on setting during decommissioning are likely to be similar to those experienced during construction the Inspectorate is of the opinion that this matter cannot be scoped out at this stage. Cultural heritage should be a consideration as part of any outline decommissioning plans.</p>	<p>Decommissioning activity may result in unintended direct impacts to currently unknown heritage assets within the Site, with potential for significant effects to occur without mitigation. This matter is therefore scoped into the assessment.</p> <p>Although the precise decommissioning methodology is not yet known, provisions in the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> will secure no additional disturbance to archaeological remains.</p>
3.4.10	Paragraph 6.4.1	Consultation	<p>The Applicant is also advised to liaise with the Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire who act on behalf of North Kesteven District Council, especially in relation to the scope of and timing of any intrusive</p>	<p>Noted. Consultation with Heritage Lincolnshire (Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire) has been undertaken along with engagement with the County Archaeologist to discuss the scope and timing of the intrusive evaluation.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			evaluation following completion of the geophysical survey.	Details of consultation held to date are included within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b> .
3.4.11	Paragraph 6.4.2	Study area - cultural heritage	The Scoping Report proposes a 2km study area for non-designated assets. For the assessment of setting, the study area should be agreed with the relevant stakeholders and informed by the visual analysis.	Study area for setting has been informed by the ZTV. A 2km study area for non-designated heritage assets and a 5km study area for designated heritage assets has been used, as agreed with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council.  Further information related to the study area can be found within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .
3.4.12	Paragraph 6.4.3	Data sources	The Applicant is advised to also consider the North Kesteven District Council's local list of non-designated heritage assets and the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan which contains schedules and descriptions of heritage assets within the Plan area.	This information has been reviewed and included within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> .
3.4.13	Paragraphs 6.4.4 and 6.4.6	Intrusive evaluation	The Scoping Report proposes a programme of archaeological investigation and recording secured by a DCO Requirement. Measures to mitigate risk to buried archaeological remains such as exclusion zones/ avoidance routes and concrete shoes rather than	The scope of the archaeological investigation that has been undertaken to date was informed by the geophysical survey ( <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.4: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> ) and engagement with Lincolnshire County Archaeologist and Heritage Lincolnshire as detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter</b>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>piles require a robust understanding of archaeological risk to be effective. These considerations should be factored into the programme and scope of intrusive evaluation (if required), to be agreed with the statutory consultees. Noting the responses from North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council indicating the potential need for intrusive field evaluation to understand the full extent of any potential impact, and inform a fuller programme of archaeological investigation and ultimately the scheme design, the Inspectorate advises that further discussions are held with the relevant consultation bodies to discuss the detailed findings of desk studies and geophysical surveys, and whether these area adequate to inform design, assess the effects of the scheme and demonstrate that any potential significant effects can be adequately mitigated. Pending the results of the non-intrusive surveys the Inspectorate is not in a position to agree that a programme of intrusive archaeological investigation is not required to inform the ES.</p>	<p><b>9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1].</b> The results of the trial trenching have informed the ES, design development and mitigation measures which are detailed and secured in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7].</b></p> <p>The Desk-Based Assessment (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>), aerial investigation and mapping (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.3: Aerial Investigation Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>), geophysical survey results (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.4: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>) and trial trenching that has been undertaken to date (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.5: Archaeological Trial Trenching Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>) have informed the mitigation strategy and the scope of further trenching. The archaeological mitigation strategy and proposed scope of further trenching to be undertaken during detailed design is detailed within the <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (oWSI) [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> and secured as a Requirement in the <b>Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1].</b></p> <p>Foundation design to consider and minimise impacts to buried archaeology through the choice of foundation type such as the use of concrete</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
				shoes are secured within the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> .
3.4.14	Paragraph 6.4.8	Receptors to be scoped in	The ES should assess the effects on the Conservation Areas at Scopwick, Blankney and Bloxholm where significant effects are likely to occur.	The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment ( <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> ) has considered the effects on these conservation areas, the layout has been designed to minimize effects and significant effects are not predicted, therefore no further assessment has been included within the ES.
<b>Landscape and Visual</b>				
3.5.1	Paragraph 6.5.9	Assessment of impacts to Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding National Beauty (AONB) during construction, operation and decommissioning	The Scoping Report states that the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB is located over 20km away from the Proposed Development. Due to the distance and intervisibility, an assessment of impacts on the AONB is proposed to be scoped out of the LVIA. Considering the nature and characteristics of the Proposed Development and the distances involved, the Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of impacts on the AONB can be scoped out of the ES.	An assessment of impacts on the AONB has been scoped out of the ES.
3.5.2	Paragraph 6.5.9	Assessment of impacts to Lincoln Cliff Area	The Scoping Report states that the Lincoln Cliff AGLV is located over 3km to the west of the Proposed Development	An assessment of impacts on the Lincoln Cliff AGLV has been scoped out of the ES. The AGLV is a west facing scarp slope, orientated north to

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
		of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) during construction, operation and decommissioning	and it is proposed to be scoped out due to no intervisibility confirmed through field work. On this basis, the Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of impacts on the AGLV can be scoped out of the ES. The ES should demonstrate there is no intervisibility with reference to photos from field work or other appropriate evidence.	south and located over 3km to the west of the Site. Updated ZTVs are presented in <b>ES Volume 2, Figures 10.5 to 10.9 [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b> and demonstrate that there would be no visibility of the Proposed Development from this AGLV. At the request of Lincolnshire County Council /North Kesteven District Council a number of potential viewpoints were visited and photographed during field work but having established that there would be no view of the development from these locations it was agreed in a meeting with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council on 3 <sup>rd</sup> July 2023 that it was not necessary to include a viewpoint in the LVIA from within the AGLV.
<b>3.5.3</b>	Paragraph 6.5.9	Other Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) in the North Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment during construction, operation and decommissioning	Although some distant visibility is indicated by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV), the Scoping Report proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that the field work has established that there would be no intervisibility between the site and any other LCAs. The Inspectorate is content for these receptors to be scoped out, however the ZTV should be reviewed with the final scheme and presented in the ES to demonstrate that there is no intervisibility.	Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) other than the two host LCAs in which the Proposed Development is located have been scoped out of the ES.  Updated ZTVs are presented in <b>ES Volume 2, Figures 10.5 to 10.9 [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b> and demonstrate that there would be no visibility of the Proposed Development from other character areas to the west. Although the ZTVs indicate some 'theoretical visibility' of the Proposed Development within LCA 13 to the east, site visits at various times during the year have established that the Proposed Development would not be discernible from any location within this character area. Effects



ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
				<p>on all LCAs other than LCA 7: Limestone Heath and LCA 11: Central Clays and Gravels would be negligible.</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council/North Kesteven District Council confirmed in a letter dated 15<sup>th</sup> August 2023 that <i>'LCA 6 Lincoln Cliff and LCA 13 Fenland sit to the fringes of the proposed study areas, and are unlikely to experience significant effects and subsequently are acceptable to be scoped out, however we would recommend these LCAs are identified in the LVIA, and if scoped out a brief statement is provided that recognises their proximity to the red line boundary and the rationale as to why they have been scoped out.'</i> <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> provides a brief statement to this effect.</p>
3.5.4	Paragraph 6.5.9	View from Villages/ hamlets of Bloxham [sic], Digby, Dorrington, Ruskington, Leasingham, Cranwell, RAF Cranwell, Wellingore and Navenby and other	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that it is highly unlikely there would be any views of the Proposed Development from these settlements when taking into account intervening hedgerows and other vegetation, stating that any glimpses would be distant, filtered and negligible. The ES should demonstrate there is no intervisibility, otherwise the potential effects on views and visual amenity within	Updated ZTVs are presented in <b>ES Volume 2, Figures 10.5 to 10.9 [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b> and demonstrate that there would be no visibility of the Proposed Development from within any of these settlements. Whilst the ZTVs suggest theoretical visibility may extend up the edge of some of these settlements, site visits are various times during the year have concluded that in each case, there would be no view from these distant settlements due to intervening distance and hedgerows or other vegetation. Any glimpses of the Proposed Development would be distant, filtered and barely

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
		settlements along the A607 during construction, operation and decommissioning	the ZTV where significant effects are likely to occur should be assessed.	<p>discernible. In each case the effects would be negligible and would fall well short of a likely significant effect.</p> <p>It was agreed in a meeting with Lincolnshire County Council /North Kesteven District Council on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2023 that it was not necessary to include a viewpoint from these villages due to the lack of any visibility from them. Lincolnshire County Council /North Kesteven District Council confirmed in a letter dated 15<sup>th</sup> August 2023 that the viewpoint selection was <i>'proportional to the project and extent of potential visual receptors.'</i></p> <p>All of these settlements have therefore been scoped out of the LVIA.</p>
3.5.5	Paragraph 6.5.9	Assessment of impacts to PRoW and local roads beyond 3km from the site during construction.	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out these receptors in the LVIA due to the distance and intervisibility. The Inspectorate considers that these matters may be scoped out on the basis of the relatively short duration of any potential effect.	An assessment of impacts on PRoW and local roads beyond 3km from the Site during construction has been scoped out of the ES. Further justification is provided within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .
3.5.6	Paragraph 6.5.9	Assessment of impacts to isolated residential properties over 1km from the site during	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that it is a matter of private visual amenity which would not give rise to an overbearing effect on residential amenity. Insufficient information has been provided regarding the nature of these receptors and extent	A detailed Residential Visual Amenity Assessment for those properties closest to the Proposed Development and which are likely to be most affected by views of the Proposed Development is presented in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.5: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> . The study area for the

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
		construction, operation and decommissioning	of visibility, therefore the Inspectorate is unable to scope out this matter out at this stage.	Residential Visual Amenity Assessment is fully justified in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.5: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> . For the avoidance of doubt, visual effects on residential properties not included in the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment including those beyond 1km are still considered in less detail in the LVIA.
<b>3.5.7</b>	Paragraph 6.5.9	Assessment of impacts to users of the rail network, specifically the section between Metheringham and the level crossing on the B1191 during construction, operation and decommissioning	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out these receptors in the LVIA due to their sensitivity being medium/ low. The Inspectorate considers that these matters may be scoped out on the basis of the relatively short duration and intermittent nature of any potential effect.	An assessment of visual impacts on the rail network, specifically the section between Metheringham and the level crossing on the B1191 has been scoped out of <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .
<b>3.5.8</b>	Paragraphs 6.5.2 and 6.5.7	Study area - landscape and visual impact	The Scoping Report paragraph 6.5.2 proposes that the LVIA study area will be within 3km of the site boundary of the Proposed Development and extended to 5km for the National Grid and Project Substation and National Grid connecting towers. However, the full extent of potential visibility of the Proposed Development is not yet fully known and	The study area was discussed with Lincolnshire County Council/North Kesteven District Council and on 15 <sup>th</sup> August 2023 they confirmed that <i>'The proposed 3km study area is appropriate from the solar PV development and 5km from the National Grid and Project Substation and National Grid connecting towers. However, the LVIA should clearly state the justification for these study areas,</i>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>the ZTV mapping contained within Appendix F identified potential visibility beyond these extents. The ES should justify the extent of the study area/s with reference to recognised professional guidance and the extent of the likely impacts, informed by fieldwork and relevant models or approaches such as the ZTV. The Applicant should agree the study areas with relevant consultation bodies.</p>	<p><i>and thoroughly assess and confirm no significant views are available from beyond the study area.'</i></p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, National Grid connecting towers no longer form part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Updated ZTVs are presented in <b>ES Volume 2, Figures 10.5 to 10.9 [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b> and a full justification for the LVIA study area is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. Any landscape and visual effects beyond the study area would be negligible and not significant. The study area for this assessment has therefore been set as a 3km offset from any siting zones for elements up to 6m in height. This includes all the siting zones for Solar PV modules, Satellite Collector Compounds and BESS. The study area has been extended where necessary to 5km from the siting zone for structures up to 12m in height which includes the proposed location of the Springwell Substation and Main Collector Compound.</p>
3.5.9	Paragraph 6.5.6	Mitigation	<p>The Scoping Report states that an oLEMP will be developed to secure the long-term management of the landscape and biodiversity strategy. The ES should cover the establishment period of any Landscape Scheme. The Inspectorate</p>	<p>For assessing landscape and visual effects, the following assumptions have been made regarding newly planted vegetation growth rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New hedgerows and woodland/shrub will be planted as young transplants (0.6m–0.8m high) in protective tubes.</li> </ul>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>draws the Applicant's attention to the comments of Lincolnshire County Council regarding the establishment period and content of the management plan (see Appendix 2 of this Opinion).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By Year 10, hedgerows will reach a maintained height of 3.5m, with minimal growth in the first year and an average annual growth of 0.4m thereafter.</li> <li>• Woodland/scrub will grow to 4m by Year 10, without height restriction.</li> <li>• Hedgerow trees and mature trees planted as larger specimens will start at 3m–3.5m and grow to approximately 6m by Year 10.</li> <li>• Trees and scrub, unless managed, will continue natural growth throughout and beyond the operational life of the Proposed Development.</li> </ul> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> assess the effects at Year 1 and Year 10.</p> <p>The <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> covers the establishment period of the embedded mitigation which includes a landscaping scheme. The <b>oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> has been prepared with consideration given to the comments of Lincolnshire County Council.</p>
<p><b>Land, soil and groundwater</b></p>				
3.6.1	Paragraph 6.6.9	Land contamination	<p>The Scoping Report justifies scoping out impacts to land based on the findings of a Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA),</p>	<p>An assessment of land contamination for the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning phase has been included</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
		and minerals (all phases)	<p>embedded mitigation measures and industry best practice procedures. The Scoping Report states that any negative implications for the Mineral Safeguarding Areas would be minimised and considered as part of the Proposed Development design.</p> <p>The findings of the PRA have not been presented in detail within the Scoping Report and paragraph 6.6.5 seems to suggest some risk of contamination. In light of this, there is insufficient evidence to scope this matter out at this stage. The ES should be supported by the findings of a PRA and where land contamination is identified, the ES should assess significant effects where they are likely to occur.</p> <p>Potential risks of soil and water contamination from leaks, improper storage, or spills during the construction phase, should be mitigated through implementation of standard best practice measures secured via the oCEMP.</p> <p>The Inspectorate considers that a Minerals Assessment should be undertaken to inform and influence the design and layout of the development and</p>	<p>within the ES presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment concluded that no likely significant land contamination effects are anticipated.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.2: Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> assesses potential land contamination sources and geotechnical constraints to the Proposed Development. The Preliminary Risk Assessment report is presented as The PRA identified no potentially significant on-site land contamination nor geotechnical issues during the Site reconnaissance survey.</p> <p>A Mineral Safeguarding Assessment has been prepared, which forms Appendix 2 of the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b> to demonstrate how impacts to Mineral Safeguarding Areas have been addressed. On the basis the Proposed Development has a lifespan of up to 40 years and due to the Proposed Development being decommissioned at the end of its operational life, any minerals would not be permanently sterilised and would be available to exploit if required at a future date. The minerals within the Order Limits will not be permanently sterilised, and post-decommissioning, the land could be worked for minerals. The Proposed Development is reservable by nature, and therefore there is not</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>demonstrate how impacts to Mineral Safeguarding Areas have been minimised. The ES should also confirm if borrow pits are proposed, assess the impacts, and identify the location of these within the Order Limits. The ES should demonstrate that the Minerals Planning Authority has been consulted in respect of all of the proposals and that the proposed development does not impact on future ambitions for minerals extraction within the region.</p>	<p>considered to be any conflict with the M11 mineral safeguarding policy.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged on the need to undertake a Mineral Safeguarding Assessment as part of its pre-application engagement with host authorities. Further detail on engagement to is set out in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Borrow pits are no longer proposed as part of the Proposed Development and were discounted at Stage Two of the design development. Risk of contamination will be mitigated through the implementation of best practice measures which are secured in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>, <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> and <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>
3.6.2	Paragraph 6.6.9	Groundwater (all phases)	<p>The Scoping Report argues that the quality of groundwater in Source Protection Zones (SPZs) would be appropriately protected by embedded mitigation measures, and the project surface water strategy would mirror the existing surface water regime, so having</p>	<p>Impacts on groundwater during the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning phase have been assessed as detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> (which forms an appendix to the <b>Flood Risk Assessment</b></p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>minimal effect on the existing groundwater conditions.</p> <p>The site overlies an SPZ and a Principal Aquifer of high vulnerability and construction activities may lead to a creation of contamination pathways e.g. piling, trenching, borrow pits. The ES should assess impacts from all phases of the development to groundwater where significant effects are likely to occur. Best practice measures should be employed and secured via the DCO to ensure any potential pollution impacts are minimised.</p>	<p><b>[EN010149/APP/7.16]</b> will ensure that the surface water regime during construction will continue to mirror the existing surface water regime and will ensure that there is minimal effect on the existing groundwater conditions.</p> <p>Risk of contamination will be mitigated through the implementation of best practice pollution prevention measures which are secured in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>, <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> and <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>
3.6.3	Paragraph 6.6.9	Soils (operation)	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out operational impacts to soils as significant vehicle movements within the Site during operation are not anticipated and therefore the potential for compaction is considered limited. The Inspectorate agrees that impacts from compaction could be scoped out of the operational phase.</p> <p>However, there is no reference in the Scoping Report as to whether or how agricultural land use would be continued across the site alongside the operation of the solar farm. Changes to the</p>	<p>The area proposed for the cable routes will be temporarily used for the purposes of construction and thereafter during operation will be retained as agricultural land. There is also the potential to use the open spaces between the infrastructure and the land beneath the Solar PV modules for pastoral farming (sheep grazing) during the operation (including maintenance) phase.</p> <p>The soil will be managed during the operational phase by the implementation of measures set out in the <b>Outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b> to minimise impacts to the soil. The <b>oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b> provides details of those areas within the Site which have</p>



ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>hydrogeological regime as a result of the Proposed Development may also affect the quality of soils within the Site and this should be assessed within the ES.</p>	<p>greater resilience and specifies measures such as timing of the works, to limit the impacts to the soil. The <b>oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b> also details measures for soil management and instructions for applying the principles of best practice to maintain the physical properties of the soil, with the aim of restoring the land to its pre-construction condition at the end of the lifetime of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Consideration of the hydrogeological regime is presented in the <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and concludes that it is not anticipated that there will be any significant changes to the hydrogeological regime as a result of the operational Proposed Development and no impacts affecting the quality of soil within the Site are anticipated.</p>
3.6.4	Paragraph 6.6.9	Soils (decommissioning)	<p>The Scoping Report argues that any effects on soils during decommissioning would not be expected to be significant as the number of vehicle movements is anticipated to be less than during the construction phase, limiting the potential for compaction of soils to occur. Decommissioning works are also less likely than construction works to adversely impact on agricultural field drains as there would be no requirement for piling etc., so are less likely to result in</p>	Noted.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			deterioration of soil quality. The Inspectorate agrees with the rationale for scoping this matter out.	
3.6.5	Paragraph 6.6.5	Agricultural Land Classification (ALC)	The Scoping Report explains that an ALC survey is currently underway. The scope of the survey should align with the Natural England 'Technical Information Note TIN049: Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile land, 2nd edition (2012)'.	<p>The ALC survey was undertaken in line with the Natural England 'Technical Information Note TIN049: Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile land', 2nd edition (2012).</p> <p>The Agricultural Land Classification surveys for each area of the Site (Springwell West, Springwell Central and Springwell East) are presented within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.1 A-C [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>
3.6.6	Paragraph 6.6.5	Unexploded Ordnance (UXO)	The Scoping Report notes that the proximity of RAF Digby suggests that there is the potential for unexploded ordnance to have been present at the Site. The ES should assess the risk of disturbing UXO through piling and other works.	<p>Detailed Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Risk Assessment has been undertaken for the Site (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.3: Detailed UXO Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>) which determined that the majority of the Site is at low risk from items of allied UXO. However, where the central-western section of the Site adjoins RAF Digby, the risk has been defined at medium to account for the multiple bombing raids which affected the RAF airfield.</p> <p>The risk of UXO will be managed by the implementation of a UXO Risk Management Plan for intrusive works and site-specific awareness briefings, alongside attendance by a UXO specialist and on-site support for intrusive works in</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
				areas of medium risk. This is secured within the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> .
3.6.7	Paragraph 6.6.8	Agricultural land (operation)	The Report proposes to scope in the operational impacts of the proposed development in terms of the loss of agricultural and BMV land because of the removal of this land from productive use. The assessment should also include and detail mitigation measures to remove, reduce or minimise such impacts.	Assessment of impacts on BMV land has been undertaken and is presented within the ES ( <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> ).  Mitigation measures to reduce impacts to soil and agricultural land are detailed and secured within the <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b> .
<b>Noise and Vibration</b>				
3.7.1	Paragraph 6.7.9	Operational vibration	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that fixed plant items or structures would not emit discernible levels of vibration during the operational phase. Based on the nature and characteristics of the Proposed Development, the Inspectorate agrees that operational vibration may be scoped out from further assessment. The ES project description should demonstrate that operational plant and equipment is of a type and to be used in locations unlikely to result in significant vibration impacts on sensitive receptors.	Receptors are considered to be located far enough away from construction works that vibration levels are expected to cause low impact or less.  This matter was proposed to be scoped out in the EIA Scoping Report, as presented in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.1: Scoping Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> . However, the EIA Scoping Opinion ( <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.2: Scoping Opinion [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> ) requested it be scoped in.  Following further review of the proposed construction methods (as detailed in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 12.2: Construction Noise Plant</b>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
3.7.2	Paragraph 6.7.9	Operational road traffic noise	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of noise associated with operational traffic on the basis that once operational the Proposed Development would generate minimal traffic.</p> <p>Considering the characteristics of the Proposed Development, the Inspectorate is content that this matter can be scoped out. The ES project description should confirm the anticipated trip generation (including number and type of vehicles) required for routine maintenance during operation to justify this.</p>	<p><b>Tables and Results [EN010149/APP/6.3])</b> and the attenuation due to the distance of receptors from works, it is anticipated that there would be no significant vibration effects to surrounding receptors during either construction or decommissioning. The scoping out of vibration during construction has been agreed with the North Kesteven District Council Environmental Health Officer. Further details regarding consultation can be found within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> provides an assessment of likely vehicle movements during routine maintenance activities. This is however expected to be undertaken by isolated vehicles on a periodic basis. As outlined within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>, it is estimated that approximately 10 LGVs will be required across all links on a daily basis for routine day to day operation and maintenance. Owing to this low number, and as these vehicle movements are well within the 10% daily variation of traffic flows to be expected across the highway network, these vehicle movements will be imperceptible.</p>
3.7.3	Paragraph 6.7.2	Study area and sensitive receptors - noise and vibration	<p>Scoping Report paragraph 6.7.2 states that the study area will be defined based on the Applicant's experience of solar farm developments and proposed</p>	<p>The study area for the construction and decommissioning phase assessments considers noise and vibration sensitive receptors that are located within 300m of the Order Limits. This has</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>locations of operation equipment/ structures and construction/ decommissioning pathways. The ES should explain how the study area and sensitive receptors have been selected with reference to relevant supporting evidence, such as noise modelling/ noise contour mapping.</p>	<p>been determined based on the guidance set out in BS 5228-1: 2009+A1: 2014, BS 5228-2: 2009+A1: 2014 and DMRB document ref. 'LA 111 - Noise and Vibration'.</p> <p>Further information regarding the study area can be found within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. Noise contour mapping is provided within <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 12.3: Daytime Specific Noise Contours</b> and <b>Figure 12.4: Night-time Specific Noise Contours [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>.</p>
3.7.4	Paragraph 6.7.4	Baseline survey	<p>The Scoping Report proposes the baseline noise monitoring to be undertaken along the site boundary. The ES should explain how the baseline noise monitoring locations were chosen and how they are deemed to be representative of nearby receptors.</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> provides a full narrative of the baseline monitoring locations, the nearest sensitive receptors which the baseline monitoring represents and full details of the measured levels and their impact on the derived design targets (to be applied at receptor locations) in noise terms.</p> <p>The choice of baseline survey locations was informed by the aerial photography and mapping and address based data for residential properties. The baseline surveys comprised unattended noise monitoring at 24 locations which have been described in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 12.1: Baseline Noise Survey Results [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> and presented in <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 12.2: Baseline Survey Locations [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>. Monitoring locations were</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
				agreed with North Kesteven District Council's Environmental Health Officer.
3.7.5	Paragraph 6.7.5	Sensitive receptors	The Scoping Report states that the receptors likely to be incorporated into the assessment are all residential in nature. The ES should also consider if there are any ecological receptors that require consideration in respect of noise related impacts.	<b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> includes a consideration of ecological receptors and confirms that there are no Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Protection Areas (SPA), or Ramsar sites adjacent within close proximity to the Site.
3.7.6	n/a	Plans - noise and vibration	The ES should provide a plan showing the location of all sensitive receptors identified for assessment overlaid with noise contour mapping to aid understanding of the potential for significant effects relating to noise.	Noise contour mapping overlaid with the location of all sensitive receptors that have been assessed are provided in <b>Figure 12.3: Daytime Specific Noise Contours</b> and <b>Figure 12.4 Night-time Specific Noise Contours [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>
<b>Traffic and transport</b>				
3.8.1	Paragraph 6.8.9	Operational traffic	The Scoping Report states that the effect of operational traffic is likely to be minimal. The Inspectorate has considered the characteristics of the operational phase of the Proposed Development and based on the low levels of anticipated traffic generation is content that this matter can be scoped out. The ES description of development should clearly set out the operational vehicle types and	<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> provides an assessment of likely vehicle movements during routine maintenance activities. This is however expected to be undertaken by isolated vehicles on a periodic basis.  As outlined within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> , it is estimated that approximately 10 LGVs will be required across all links on a daily basis for routine

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>numbers (with reference to thresholds within guidance) to justify this position.</p>	<p>day to day operation and maintenance. Owing to this low number, and as these vehicle movements are well within the 10% daily variation of traffic flows to be expected across the highway network, these vehicle movements will be imperceptible, thus an assessment is not required.</p> <p>As well as routine maintenance there may also be a requirement to repair and replace components on site as part of maintaining the Proposed Development during the operational phase. This could require the use of HGVs. The number of HGVs required for these works is not known at this stage, given the extent of any repair and replacement works is unknown, however as traffic flows are not expected to exceed the IEMA guidance Rule 1 criteria "Include highway links where traffic flows will increase by more than 30% (or the number of heavy goods vehicles will increase by more than 30%)" and so an operational traffic assessment is not required in accordance with the Scoping Opinion. In addition, such works will not be undertaken frequently and highway works delivered for construction accesses will be retained permanently during operation, as set out in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>
3.8.2	Paragraph 6.8.2	Study area	<p>The scoping report suggests a study area to include the B1189, B1188, B1191, and A15. The ES should also describe how</p>	<p>Usage of the B1188, B1191, and A15 for construction traffic use was identified and therefore these were included to the study area. After</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>the Proposed Development is likely to affect the Strategic Road Network; significant effects should be assessed where they are likely to occur.</p>	<p>discussions with Lincolnshire County Council it was agreed for the exclusion of the B1189 and the inclusion of the B1202 in the ongoing assessments relating to construction traffic to those links discussed during scoping. Further information related to consultation can be found in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The nearest part of the Strategic Road Network to the Site is the A1. It is anticipated that construction traffic volumes will have substantially dispersed by the time it reaches the A1. However, the ES and Transport Assessment considers the likely volumes of traffic that will be travelling along the Strategic Road Network which is minimal and not significant.</p> <p>Traffic and Transport matters are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> supported by <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>
3.8.3	Paragraph 6.8.6	Mitigation - highway improvements	<p>If highways works/improvements are required as part of the mitigation for significant effects arising from construction transport, these should be fully explained within the ES and an assessment of any likely significant effects as a result of these works should</p>	<p>The ES considers mitigation requirements, including highway improvement works, for all routes carrying construction traffic. Full details of mitigation proposals are set out within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> supported by <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment</b></p>



ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
			<p>also be presented, as relevant. This should include consideration of any potential impacts to railway assets, such as bridges and level crossings, located on HGV routes.</p>	<p><b>[EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> including an assessment of their impacts.</p> <p>Opportunities for environmental enhancement in relation to traffic and transport are detailed in the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b> and the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b> which are submitted as part of the Development Consent Order Application. HGV routing will use the primary road network except for the last part of the journey where the B1191, a short section of the B1188 and two minor roads will be utilised. None of the latter sections of road will affect railway assets. Any weight or height restrictions on the primary road network will be adhered to and therefore no impacts are anticipated on railway assets for standard HGV construction traffic. An AIL routing study has been undertaken for the delivery of substation equipment, which utilises identified Heavy Load Routes and therefore such railway assets have already been considered in the route allocation.</p> <p>Further information is detailed in the <b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.8]</b></p>
3.8.4	Paragraph 6.8.11	Impact assessment methodology	<p>The impact assessment is proposed to be based on the methodology outlined in the Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic (1993). The</p>	<p>Given the publication of the revised IEMA guidelines in July 2023, the ES has been assessed using this revised methodology.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Applicant's Response
<p>Inspectorate understands that this guidance is planned to be updated by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA). The ES should take account of future updates where relevant.</p>				
<p><b>Cumulative effects</b></p>				
3.9.2	n/a	Other projects	<p>The study areas, methodologies (including other projects included in the assessment) particularly with respect to impacts on 'best and most versatile' agricultural land and landscape, should be agreed with the statutory consultation bodies and any exclusions should be clearly justified and explained with reference to PINS Advice Note 17: Cumulative effects assessment.</p>	<p>The study area, methodologies and the short-list of developments that have been assessed, in line with PINS Advice Note 17: Cumulative effects assessment, have been consulted on with the host authorities prior to undertaking the assessment of cumulative effects with particular regard given to landscape and visual and the regional assessment of best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>An assessment of cumulative effects is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>

# Springwell Solar Farm

Environmental Statement

Appendix 5.3b: Scoping Opinion

Response Matrix – Statutory Consultees

EN010149/APP/6.3  
November 2024  
Springwell Energyfarm Ltd

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)  
Planning Act 2008  
Infrastructure Planning  
(Applications: Prescribed Forms  
and Procedure) Regulations 2009

## EIA Scoping Opinion Response Matrix – Statutory Consultees

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Anglian Water</b>		
<b>Anglian Water</b>	<p>Anglian Water notes that at 5.5.2 (page 51) the promoter identifies Anglian Water pipeline (clean) from the utility search. We would support efforts to minimise and potentially remove impacts on water and water recycling assets through project layout, design and construction approaches. At 5.9.26 (page 64) the promoter indicates that sewerage supply and capacity will be assessed with Anglian Water. The statement that 'The Proposed Development is expected to have an impact on the public foul water sewers in the vicinity of the Site due to the increase in foul flows arising from the Proposed Development' means we do not agree that the impact of foul flows can be scoped out (para 5.9.28, page 64). It may be possible to scope out the impact once that assessment work has been undertaken and following consultation by the promoter with the Environment Agency.</p>	<p>Water resources have been assessed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. During construction, there is likely to be increased demand on water resources temporarily. During the operational phase potable water demands will be limited to 24 staff daily. During the construction phase the demands for potable water will be higher temporarily due to increased numbers of construction staff, potable water will be supplied to the permanent welfare facilities from the Anglian Water mains supply and a bowser will be used to supply temporary welfare facilities. The chapter outlines that there will be a preferred supply of non-potable water during the construction and operational phases to come from rainwater harvesting.</p> <p>Foul water has been considered as part of water resources and has been assessed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and as part of the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> (which forms an appendix to the <b>Flood Risk</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p><b>Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]] and Statement of Common Ground - Anglian Water Services Ltd [EN010149/APP/7.21].</b> An approach to foul water has been agreed whereby sewage will be dealt within the Site privately and not connected to Anglian Water sewer.</p> <p>A connection to the foul sewer for waste water drainage from the welfare facilities is not considered to be feasible due to the distance of a foul sewer connection. Therefore, foul drainage will be provided as either package treatment works or cesspits which be managed by an appointed licensed management company. This is secured within the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> (which forms an appendix to the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]]</b>).</p> <p>The <b>Statement of Common Ground with Anglian Water Services Ltd [EN010149/APP/7.21]</b> with Anglian Water outlines ongoing consultation to ensure that water supply needs for the Proposed Development can be met, and that any potential impacts on Anglian Water's assets are minimised.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Anglian Water</b>	<p>Anglian Water also does not agree (para. 5.9.32) with the promoter scoping out water from the EIA. Anglian Water is progressing its Water Resources Management Plan and as a water scarce area designated by the Environment Agency and following detailed assessment work, we are now advising that new non household water supply requests (construction and operational phases) may be declined as these could compromise our regulatory priority of supplying existing and planned domestic growth. The flows needed to fill water storage tanks – in the event that the promoter decides not to use rain water harvesting on site to meet this non potable demand – will need to be assessed by Anglian Water to advise whether a supply is feasible with jeopardising domestic supply or at a significant financial or environmental cost. Our new position on non- household supply is due to our joint aim with the Environment Agency of reducing abstraction to protect habitats and the wider environment. The promoter will need to submit a request for water supply setting out the new daily demand for each stage of the project.</p>	<p>Consultation with Anglian Water is ongoing to determine the feasibility of a supply to meet demands at the time of writing.</p> <p>Water resources have been assessed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The site is identified as being within a 'water stress' area. During construction, there is likely to be increased demand on water resources temporarily. During the operational phase potable water demands will be limited to 24 staff daily, whilst non-domestic uses for water are likely to be minimal. The chapter outlines that there will be a preferred supply of non-potable water for non-domestic uses during the construction and operational phases to come from rainwater harvesting.</p> <p>Consultation with Anglian Water is ongoing to determine the feasibility of a supply to meet demands at the time of writing.</p>
<b>Anglian Water</b>	<p>The open position at para 5.9.11 on water use during construction means that the promoter will need to establish whether concrete production, for example, would be offsite or would need an on-site supply in order to assess the water supply options with Anglian Water. Further advice on water and wastewater capacity and options can be obtained by contacting Anglian Water's Pre Development Team at:</p> <p>████████████████████</p>	<p>Water resources have been assessed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. It is expected that pre-mixed concrete will be brought to the site during the construction phase. There may be limited hand mixing of concrete on site during the construction phase.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Anglian Water</b>	<p>On the question of Flood Risk Assessment (para. 5.9.32) we would welcome engagement on Anglian Water's existing drainage apparatus. However, we would advise that in accordance with the drainage hierarchy, surface water should first look to be managed by Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Only if the promoter could demonstrably prove that infiltration rates for example precluded SuDS in a specific location would Anglian Water consider surface water connections to the public sewer. We consider that SuDS should be used at the Substation compound (para. 2.4.65) and Anglian Water would currently resist a provision providing for a surface water connection to the public sewer in the draft DCO Order.</p>	<p>The drainage design is provided within the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> (which forms an appendix to the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b>). The drainage strategy outlines the uses of SuDS across the site where required. A connection to an Anglian Water public sewer is not being sought.</p>
<b>Anglian Water</b>	<p>In view of the guidance in the National Policy Statements we would have anticipated that the scoping would have included and then considered the approach to water supply, water resources and water recycling assets. Anglian Water requests that these points are assessed early in the EIA to set out how the project will be supplied with water, its wastewater managed, how water assets serving residents and business will be protected and how design has been altered to reduce the need for new water infrastructure or the diversion of existing assets.</p>	<p>Water resources have been assessed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. During construction, there is likely to be increase in water demand. During operational phase, potable water demands will be limited to 24 staff daily, whilst non-domestic water uses are likely to be minimal. The assessment identifies a preferred supply of non-potable water during both the construction and operational phases, prioritising rainwater harvesting. If rainwater harvesting supplies are not available, private irrigation sources will be considered. An Anglian Water mains supply will be considered where the preferred supply sources are not available.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>Wastewater will be disposed of in accordance with Environment Agency guidance.</p> <p>Water pollution prevention management measures are documented and secured by the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>, the <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> and in the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p> <p>Surface water runoff will not be discharged to Anglian Water's surface water or combined sewers systems. This is confirmed in the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> (which forms an appendix to the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b>). Foul water drainage for welfare facilities is to be provided via package treatment works or cesspits. These facilities will be drained and managed by a licensed courier with details subject to the final design of the foul water utilities.</p> <p>Consultation with Anglian Water is ongoing to determine the feasibility of a supply to</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>meet demands and measures to protect water assets at the time of writing. The following parameters and assumptions have been presented to Anglian Water and are to be agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Easement of 5m applied to Anglian Water assets;</li><li>• Small piles for solar panels within 30m along with associated infrastructure e.g. fences;</li><li>• Access track laid near or over pipeline plus ongoing use for construction and operation;</li><li>• Planting and environmental mitigation; and</li><li>• Cable trenches near or over/under pipe.</li></ul> <p>Protective provisions are to be discussed separately with the legal department, as outlined in the <b>Statement of Common Ground with Anglian Water Services Ltd [EN010149/APP/7.21]</b>.</p>
<b>Anglian Water</b>	We support the inclusion of water (5.9.16 onwards) in a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP). The CEMP and a Surface Water Management Plan should include steps to remove the risk of damage to Anglian Water assets from plant and machinery including haul roads. Further advice on minimising and then relocating Anglian Water existing assets can be obtained from: <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">[REDACTED]</span>	Noted. An <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> is provided in support of the Development Consent Order Application, which includes mitigation measures related to water.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p><b>Statement of Common Ground with Anglian Water Services Ltd [EN010149/APP/7.21]</b> is provided within the DCO Application and measures will be agreed within the protective provisions to remove the risk of damage to the Anglian Water assets.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> has been prepared and provided within the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b> which forms part of the Development Consent Order Application.</p>
<p><b>Anglian Water</b></p>	<p>The site is in the Central Lincolnshire Water Resource Zone (WRZ), which supplies water to area from the Humber and Scunthorpe to Grantham and Sleaford including Lincoln. We have flagged above the new position on water resources and note that whilst the scoping considers water environment impacts it does not look at water resources. As the site is within an area of 'serious water stress' designated by the Environment Agency and water is used in the project construction and operation this indicates that water resources should be assessed in the EIA.</p>	<p>Water resources have been assessed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, which concluded that the Proposed Development is not expected to have likely significant effects on water resources after the implementation of additional mitigation measures.</p>
<p><b>Anglian Water</b></p>	<p>Anglian Water would welcome the instigation of discussions with Springwell Energy Farm Limited as the prospective applicant, in line with the requirements of the 2008 Planning Act and guidance. Experience has shown that early engagement and agreement is required between NSIP applicants and statutory undertakers during design and assessment and well before submission of the draft DCO for examination. Consultation at the statutory PEIR stage would in our view be too late to inform design and</p>	<p><b>Statement of Common Ground with Anglian Water Services Ltd [EN010149/APP/7.21]</b> is provided within the DCO Application. and measures will be agreed within the protective provisions to remove the risk of damage to the Anglian Water assets.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
---------------------	----------	----------------------

may result in delays to the project. We would recommend discussion on the following issues: 1. Requirement for potable and raw water supplies if rainwater harvesting and other resources within the site are not used 2. Impact of development on Anglian Water's assets including abstraction 3. Requirement for water recycling (sewer) connections 4. The design of the project to minimise interaction with Anglian Water assets and specifically to avoid the need for diversions which have carbon costs 5. Confirmation of the project's cumulative impacts (if any) with Anglian Water projects 6. Draft Protective Provisions A set of draft Protective Provisions will be sent to the promoter to include in the draft DCO.

**ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]** sets out the engagement that has been undertaken with Anglian Water to date.

Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council		
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

**Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council**

Food security is of paramount importance and protected via government policy. Research by Campaign for Rural England reveals that almost 14,500 hectares of the country's best agricultural land, which could grow at least 250,000 tons of vegetables a year based on typical yields, has been permanently lost to development since 2010. This research highlights the following consequences of the reduced use of land for agriculture as follows:

- Two million fewer people can be fed 'five a day' from vegetables homegrown in England, as prime farmland is lost to development.
- Food security concerns are increasing, with 60% of England's finest agricultural land at the highest risk of flooding from climate change.
- Nearly 300,000 homes have been built on prime farmland, with an extra 1,400 hectares used for renewable energy projects; despite the availability of previously developed brownfield land waiting for regeneration.
- The East of England has lost 3,232 ha of Best, Most Versatile (BMV) land since 2010 — the greatest absolute loss within a single region.
- The National Planning Policy Framework makes the protection of BMV land a priority; the need clearly evidenced by the increase in food poverty

This issue has been given serious consideration, and it is acknowledged that a balance needs to be achieved nationally between agricultural land availability and sustainable energy production. It should be noted that the majority of the land area to be occupied by Springwell Solar Farm will be returned to agricultural land use after the development has been decommissioned (40 years per phase). An **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]** is submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application. It is noted that an increase in soil quality is likely to be achieved due to the nutrient

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>within the UK, and the food shortages experienced during the recent pandemic.</p>	<p>content of the soil improving while the soil is not employed for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>An assessment of Agricultural Land Classification data is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>, which demonstrates compliance with applicable planning policy. The assessments concluded that 42.3% of the land within the Order Limits is classified as BMV agricultural land. Construction activities are not expected to impact the soil resource enough to cause a reclassification to a lower agricultural land grade.</p>
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) is a system used in England and Wales to grade the quality of land for agricultural use; aiding planning decisions affecting greenfield sites, in-order to protect good quality land from development. The system classifies land into five grades, with grade 1 being the best quality. Planning policies state that the 1 valuable grades 1, 2 &amp; 3a should be protected from development not associated with agriculture or forestry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The negative impact of the Springwell proposal on English food security is massive. The whole development is on grade 2 and 3 land (primarily grade 2), highly productive agricultural land. If this land is developed, more food imports will be inevitable, with increased costs and uncertainty regarding food availability.</li> </ul>	<p>Food security has been given serious consideration, and it is acknowledged that a balance needs to be achieved nationally between agricultural land availability and sustainable energy production.</p> <p>The Proposed Development has sought to avoid fields of solely Grade 1 or 2 land and this has been a key consideration in the development of the design. Further detail on the design development and approach</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The development would result in the loss of agricultural land for 40 years, with little hope of the land ever being returned to agricultural use. The location of the proposed solar farm strikes at the heart of Lincolnshire's stunning and highly productive agricultural land – this must be protected</li></ul>	<p>to the design is detailed in the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>It should be noted that the majority of the land area to be occupied by Springwell Solar Farm will be returned to agricultural land use after the development has been decommissioned (40 years per phase), and as part of the Development Consent Order there will be legal requirements to ensure the Site is returned to agricultural land. An <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> is submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application. It is noted that an increase in soil quality is likely to be achieved due to the nutrient content of the soil improving while the soil is not employed for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>An assessment of Agricultural Land Classification data is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater</b> and the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>, which demonstrates compliance with applicable planning policy.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b>	Research into global warming and climate change has predicted that vast areas of UK land will be lost to the sea over the next 30 to 40 years; Lincolnshire being most at risk of all UK counties. (Reference Coastal Climate Central). In addition, the UK will see a significant increase in flooding. This data analysis provides further evidence of the importance of protecting prime agricultural land.	<p>The Proposed Development has sought to avoid fields of solely Grade 1 or 2 land and this has been a key consideration in the development of the design. Further detail on the design development and approach to the design is detailed in the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>The Site Selection Report, Appendix 1 of the <b>Planning Statement [EN01049/APP/7.2]</b> explains the process which has resulted in the Site being selected including which criteria were used in site selection and how the site selection process performs against the key requirements of NPS EN-3.</p> <p>On the matter of land type, the report also concludes that there was no available land of a lower agricultural or non-agricultural grade available which would meet the project objectives. NPS EN-3 sets a preference for the use of non-agricultural or lower grade agricultural land but accepts that the use of some agricultural land is likely, that the development of solar PV on Grade 1 and 2 land is not prohibited and that land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>In response to a petition titled 'Ban development on agricultural land to increase food self-sufficiency' DEFRA made the following statement:</p> <p>“This Government has committed to broadly maintaining current levels of food production in the Food Strategy, to ensure our continued levels of food security.</p> <p>There will always be multiple pressures on land which require individual landowners, managers and Government to make decisions about trade-offs. DEFRA and DLUHC are working on striking the right balance. The National Planning Policy Framework aims to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals; recognising the economic and other benefits of</p>	<p>suitability of the site location (see para. 2.10.29 of NPS EN-3).</p> <p>It is also worth noting that the Site is not at any significant increase of flood risk from the sea as a result of climate change. A Flood Risk Assessment in line with DEFRA guidance is presented within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 15.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> which assesses the impacts of climate change on flood risk. Relevant policy tests are considered in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b> which forms part of the Development Consent Order Application.</p> <p>Noted. Relevant policy tests for the use of agricultural land by NSIPs are considered in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b> which forms part of the Development Consent Order Application.</p> <p>An assessment of Agricultural Land Classification data is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>, which demonstrates</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>this land. It sets out a clear presumption away from the use of high-quality agricultural land for development where possible.</p> <p>DEFRA are committed to making the most of brownfield land and existing policy for protecting greenfield remains firmly in place.</p> <p>Recognising the importance of food security, in the Agriculture Act 2020 the Government made a commitment to produce an assessment of our food security at least once every three years. The first UK Food Security Report was published in December 2021. The report recognises the contribution made by British agriculture to our resilience, and the importance of strong domestic production to our food security. It considers the UK's food supply sources overall, noting that domestic production and diversity of supply are both important to our food security”</p>	<p>compliance with applicable planning policy. The assessments concluded that 42.3% of the land within the Order Limits is classified as BMV agricultural land. Construction activities are not expected to impact the soil resource enough to cause a reclassification to a lower agricultural land grade. The duration of the operational Proposed Development is 40 years per phase. The majority of the land area to be occupied by Springwell Solar Farm will be returned to agricultural land use after the development has been decommissioned (40 years per phase), and as part of the Development Consent Order there will be legal requirements to ensure the Site is returned to agricultural land. An <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> is submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application. It is noted that an increase in soil quality is likely to be achieved due to the nutrient content of the soil improving while the soil is not employed for agricultural purposes.</p>
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer</b></p>	<p>A recent leaflet produced by Springwell, informed local residents of imminent soil testing within the proposed site, over a 6-week period. It is imperative that an independent, government appointed organisation, confirms the findings.</p>	<p>Noted. Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) methodology has been confirmed and approved by Natural England. ALC data is presented within <b>ES Volume 1</b>,</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b>		<b>Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1] and supported by ES Volume 2, Figure 11.1: Agricultural Land Classification and Figure 11.2: DCO Masterplan overlaid with the Agricultural Land Classification Results [EN010149/APP/6.2]; and ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.1A: Springwell Central Agricultural Land Classification, Appendix 11.1B: Springwell East, Lincolnshire Agricultural Land Classification, and Appendix 11.1C: Springwell West, Lincolnshire Agricultural Land Classification [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b>
<b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b>	Regardless of mitigation, there is no doubt the project will have a detrimental effect on wildlife and habitats. The site area is heavily populated with wildlife, including deer, muntjac, hares, rabbits, foxes, badgers and birds of prey.	A desktop assessment, site surveys and a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) survey was carried out to understand the existing biodiversity baseline of the site and to identify species that require further assessment. Full details of the PEA survey and species-specific survey methodology can be found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.1: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> . Wildlife has been considered in the biodiversity impact assessment, which is detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> . Desk

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>based studies and various ecology surveys have been carried out within the Site and wider area between 2002 and 2024 to ensure that wildlife has been considered in the assessments. North Kesteven District Council and Natural England were consulted on the scope of the ecology surveys and they were agreed as sufficient to provide baseline information about the importance of the Site for wildlife, on which to make an informed assessment of the impacts on biodiversity.</p> <p>Data results from further species or habitat specific surveys are included within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendices 7.2 - 7.13 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p><b>A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) No Significant Effects Screening Report (NSER) [EN010149/APP/7.17]</b> has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to set out whether the Proposed Development is likely to have any significant effect on European designated site which is submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Landscape - The scale of harm in this location is such that, it would not be outweighed by the wider benefits of the renewable energy provision.</p>	<p>Embedded mitigation measures and additional mitigation will be secured within the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>, <b>Works Plans [EN010149/APP/2.3]</b>, <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>, <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b>, <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> and <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>.</p> <p>An assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The relevant policy tests are presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has been informed by technical landscape and visual analysis. The design also incorporates landscape planting to mitigate and screen views of the Solar PV modules. The landscape planting proposals are detailed and secured in the <b>Outline</b></p>

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

**Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9].**

It is acknowledged in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]** that some adverse effects on landscape and visual amenity will remain even with mitigation in place but this would be the case wherever this infrastructure was located within Order Limits or the wider landscape.

Solar development at scale is needed to help meet the urgent need for home grown, secure, renewable energy that is required by Government policy to address climate change and energy security. The scale of development is an important factor, and maximising the generating capacity of schemes improves their economic efficiency, bringing power to market at the lowest cost possible. It is shown that larger schemes deliver more quickly and at a lower unit cost than multiple independent schemes which make up the same total capacity. The **Statement of Need [EN010149/APP/7.1]**, which supports the DCO Application, provides further detail on

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

the need and scale for the Proposed Development.

The size and location of the Proposed Development has been carefully considered, balancing the need to maximise the grid capacity whilst also making most efficient use of the land and avoiding unacceptable impacts. The **Planning Statement [EN10149/APP/7.2]** sets out the reasoning for the Proposed Development including its size and location.

The Proposed Development equates to an output of 1MW per 2.4 acres which represents an efficient use of the land for solar PV and associated infrastructure within the range identified at paragraph 2.10.17 of NPS EN-3. The **Planning Statement. Appendix 3: Policy Compliance Assessment Tables [EN10149/APP/7.2]** provides detailed evidence of compliance with relevant national and local policy documents and a comprehensive assessment. Following Phase Two Consultation, the design of the Proposed Development has been reviewed and revised to take account of stakeholder engagement, technical

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Landscape - The Secretary of State, Planning Inspectors and Planning Officers have identified that solar farm developments do invariably detract from the unspoiled character and appearance of the landscape.</p>	<p>assessment and advice, and the outcomes of the Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>This has included amendments to the Order Limits and potential areas for Solar PV development as set out with the <b>Design Approach Document [EN10149/APP/7.3]</b>. This has resulted in overall reduction of the Order Limits to 1,280ha (compared to 1,702ha at Phase One and 1,772ha at Phase Two).</p>
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>The solid structures of the proposed solar arrays would form a strong physical presence of industrial appearance which would change the character of the rural fields in which they are located and be significantly out of proportion.</p>	<p>An assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, which includes an assessment on impacts landscape character and visual impacts.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, identifies that there are likely significant impacts at seven visual receptor groups, with impacts on three of these groups lasting for the duration of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>From the outset of site selection, the Applicant sought to avoid or minimise interaction with sensitive landscape receptors and subsequently has proposed</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b>	The proposed development would be an incongruous industrial and alien intrusion that would be harmful to the landscape character of the area, and a discordant feature within the pastoral setting. It would clearly cause harm to the visual enjoyment of those that live in, or visit the area.	<p>a suite of mitigation measures to limit potential impacts (see the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b>). However, the Applicant acknowledges that the rural nature of the Site and the type of development proposed means that some of these effects cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>Given the approach to design and mitigation that the Applicant has rigorously followed it is considered that the designation of the development as a CNP project and the weight which such a designation applies means that such impacts are outweighed by the critical need for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>An assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment acknowledges that some significant effects on landscape character would arise principally from a localised change in land cover and the introduction of new Solar PV development, Satellite Collector Compounds, BESS, Springwell Substation and ancillary infrastructure such as fencing and CCTV into fields which are</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer</b></p>	<p>The proposed development is out of keeping with rural character of the area. The solid structures of the arrays would form a strong physical presence of industrial appearance which would change the character of the rural fields in which they are located. The development would be visible in</p>	<p>currently in agricultural land use. The Solar PV development would, however, be underlain by grassland and mitigated by extensive new hedgerow and woodland planting as outlined in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>. The design of the Proposed Development and the new planting proposed is considered to be adequate to mitigate potentially adverse effects of the Proposed Development.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> includes an assessment on the effects on visual amenity. The assessment records that in the early years of operation there would initially be a moderate adverse visual effect (significant) on users of the Spires and Steeple Trail which passes between Scopwick and Blankney but that by Year 10 when mitigation planting has matured, the effect would reduce to minor adverse (not significant).</p>
<p>An assessment of landscape effects is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment</p>		



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b>	<p>wider views and would form an incongruous expanse of metal structures out of keeping with the intimate and rural character of the area, and would be disproportionate to the scale of other landscape features. The solar farm would significantly adversely impact the character and appearance of the landscape. The expansive tranquil landscape of open green fields with far reaching views would turn into a semi-industrial, utility-grade power complex, with fields of 3m high dark solar panels, shipping containers containing electrical equipment and security fencing. As such, we consider the proposed development contravenes Local Planning Policy, which requires that development proposals protect, enhance or restore the landscape character for its own intrinsic beauty, for future generations.</p>	<p>confirms that Springwell West is located within LCA 7: Limestone Heath. The assessment considers the sensitivity of the character area.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has been developed to respond to the distinctive and unique local character of the Site, informed by relevant local studies such as North Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment. This is set out in the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b> and is one of the Project Principles (Principle 2.2) which has been used to guide the design.</p> <p>The assessment acknowledges that some significant effects on landscape character would arise principally from a localised change in land cover and the introduction of new Solar PV development, Satellite Collector Compounds, BESS, Springwell Substation and ancillary infrastructure such as fencing and CCTV into fields which are currently in agricultural land use. The Solar PV development would, however, be underlain by grassland and mitigated by extensive new hedgerow and woodland planting as outlined in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>. The design of</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Springwell have commissioned RSK Environment Ltd to prepare the Environment Impact Assessment but they are not an independent body. They are owned by a major US private Equity firm called Ares who are directly involved in the Green Energy Market. The whole report would appear to give the developers one sided viewpoint only, with little effort made to investigate negative impacts in any respect, which we find completely unacceptable.</p>	<p>the Proposed Development and the new planting proposed is considered to be adequate to mitigate potentially adverse effects of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>RSK is not owned by Ares. RSK is a privately held, employee-owned business.</p> <p>RSK is held to the same high standards of professionalism as all Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) consultants, including through its registration with the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) EIA Quality Mark. The scheme includes independent review of RSKs EIA work as well as its delivery against seven 'EIA commitments'.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement identifies a range of possible impacts of the Proposed Development, including both beneficial and adverse, together with mitigation measures to maximise beneficial effects and prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset adverse effects.</p>
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple</b></p>	<p>Our research has highlighted that the land is highly unlikely to be returned to agricultural land, indeed, how can the land be 'returned to agricultural land' as stated in the original Springwell consultation booklet, when only the above ground infrastructure is proposed to be removed? More information needs to be provided detailing what exactly will remain</p>	<p>Following decommissioning the land will be returned to the landowner for agricultural use. The land will be reinstated in accordance with the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>High Grange Parish Council</b>	subsurface and how will the developers a) return the land to be used again for agriculture, b) reinstate lost habitats and c) reintroduce lost species. 40 years cannot be viewed as temporary.	<p><b>Management Plan (oDEMP [EN010149/APP/7.13]) and Outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11]).</b> The oDEMP [EN010149/APP/7.13] will be subject to the approval of the local planning authorities at the time of decommissioning.</p> <p>During the lifetime of the Proposed Development the soil quality, soil structure and existing field drainage system will be protected by the procedures detailed in the oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11], as well as by mitigation measures within the management plans for the three phases of the project (<b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7], Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9] and oDEMP [EN010149/APP/7.13].</b></p> <p>The oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11] will include methodologies for activities to ensure that damage to soil structure, as well as damage to field drains, is prevented. The oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11] will control the timing of work and take into account soil saturation, ensuring that work is avoided during periods when soils are susceptible</p>

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

to damage. Other procedures to protect soils that are covered by the **oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11]** include: retaining soil profiles; avoiding compaction; ameliorating compaction; storing soils for re-use in accordance with best practice; undertaking aftercare and restoration activities in line with procedures that minimise damage; and following procedures for trenching to ensure soil horizons are maintained. Although the decommissioning phase will not adversely affect soils if the **oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11]** is followed, it is noted that if a reduction in soil quality has occurred, this can be reversed using standard agricultural soil improvement techniques, preventing medium or long-term effects on the quality of the soil.

Machinery that is used in the decommissioning phase will be of similar size, or smaller/lighter, than plant used in standard agricultural processes, so the works will not result in additional loads on the soil compared to the prior agricultural use. Damage to soils during decommissioning will be limited by adherence to the **oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11]** and **oDEMP**

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

**[EN010149/APP/7.13]**, and there is the potential to restore soils if accidental damage did occur.

Restoration works in line with the methodologies provided in the **oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11]** will ensure that the land remains at the agricultural land classification grade that was recorded prior to construction.

Land drains facilitate a quicker movement of surface water and groundwater to drainage ditches to improve land for arable uses. If the land drains are compromised then surface water will drain overland to those same drainage ditches.

Measures to avoid impact on habitats as part of the embedded design and additional mitigation and assessment of the effects and quantities of habitat loss are detailed in the **ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]**. Habitat loss (for all habitats) is quantified in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.14 – Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]**. Habitat creation and enhancement proposals are detailed within the **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]**.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The mitigation claims that the development will avoid any wildlife site by 15m, however this does not allow for the impact of removing open space from adjacent woodland.</li><li>• Regarding all mitigation in relation to biodiversity, how have all the distances been decided? We seek evidence relating to the effectiveness of the distances chosen.</li><li>• The scale and variety of wildlife in the area has not been given adequate inclusion within the scoping document; nor has the impact and threat the development would pose on wildlife. The scoping document is dismissive, when in reality the impact on local wildlife is huge, warranting significant consideration and inclusion</li></ul>	<p>The Applicant is seeking time limited consent for the Proposed Development, meaning that the operational life is temporary and after 40 years per phase the land within the Order Limit will be returned to agricultural land use.</p> <p>There will be a minimum 15m offset from the built development to existing woodland which has been secured within the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>. 15m is considered sufficient to protect tree root protection area of woodlands. According to Natural England and Forestry Commission Guidance on ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees advice for making planning decisions, a buffer zone of at least 15m from the boundary of ancient woodland is recommended to avoid root damage.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation relevant to biodiversity have been included in the design and have been outlined within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b> demonstrates how the design has been embedded to the Proposed Development. The Applicant has</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>incorporated minimum offsets to specific elements of the Proposed Development based on a combination of guidance, good practice, precedence set by other NSIP solar schemes and professional judgement from technical specialists of the project team.</p> <p>Wildlife has been considered in the biodiversity impact assessment, which is detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. Desk based studies and various ecology surveys have been carried out within the Site and wider area between 2002 and 2024 to ensure that wildlife has been considered in the assessments.</p> <p>North Kesteven District Council and Natural England were consulted on the scope of the ecology surveys and they were agreed as sufficient to provide baseline information about the importance of the Site for wildlife, on which to make an informed assessment of the impacts on biodiversity.</p> <p>Data results from further species or habitat specific surveys are included within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendices 7.2 - 7.13 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Due to this development being unprecedented due to size (over 6 times bigger than any previous project), there is no available comparable data. As such, ALL factors should be considered and not scoped out. Mitigating factors should be thoroughly investigated to relate to the sheer size of this development and current data and guidelines should be regarded as irrelevant.</p>	<p>Embedded mitigation measures and additional mitigation related to wildlife will be secured within the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4], Works Plans [EN010149/APP/2.3], Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7], Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10], Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13] and Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9].</b></p> <p>Noted. An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Report was prepared by the Applicant in respect of the Proposed Development and was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 22 March 2023, with a request for the Secretary of State to adopt a scoping opinion in relation to the Proposed Development. In considering the request for an EIA Scoping Opinion, the Secretary of State consulted with the relevant prescribed consultees under the EIA regime. The EIA Scoping Opinion was issued by the Planning Inspectorate on 2 May 2023. The scope of the EIA and therefore the factors to be</p>



**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

assessed have been determined by the EIA Scoping Opinion agreed and received from PINS. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.3: Scoping Opinion Response Matrix [EN010149/APP/6.3]** presents the responses received via the Scoping Opinion and the Applicant's responses to each matter raised.

Environmental factors agreed to be scoped into the assessment include, air quality, biodiversity, climate, cultural heritage, landscape and visual, land, soil and groundwater, noise and vibration, population, traffic and transport, water and cumulative effects. Assessments of each environmental factor can be found in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 6 to 16 [EN010149/APP/6.1]**.

The Planning Inspectorate has agreed (via the Scoping Opinion response) that the following environmental factors/other environmental considerations can be scoped out of further the assessment: glint and glare, heat and radiation, major accident and disasters, utilities, human health, material assets and waste, Electric , magnetic and electromagnetic fields. Justification for this agreement, and the

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

approach taken, is presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA [EN010149/APP/6.1]**.

If consent is granted for the Springwell Solar Farm, the Applicant will be required to comply with requirements that ensure the implementation of the mitigation measures in these plans. These plans set out how different phases and aspects of the scheme will be controlled, managed, or monitored. The following outline management plans are submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application:

- **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7];**
- **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10];**
- **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13];**
- **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9];**

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p><u>Glint and Glare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This should not be scoped out. There are no guidelines setting out a particular methodological approach to delivering a glint and glare assessment. The paragraph says the Secretary of State should assess the potential impact on glint and glare on nearby homes and motorists. Clearly this should be included, with particular emphasis on the panels facing houses, horses and oncoming traffic.</li> <li>• There are operational military bases in close proximity to the development; RAF Cranwell, RAF Waddington, RAF Conningsby. In addition, the area also a number of private airfields, all of which should be consulted and considered.</li> <li>• The Lincs &amp; Notts Air Ambulance is based at RAF Waddington. As such they would have to fly over the site for any emergencies to the south east of their headquarters. It is imperative that they are consulted to discuss the impact of glint and glare while flying over the area, and possible landing difficulties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.8];</b></li> <li>• <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12];</b></li> <li>• <b>Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.20];</b> and</li> <li>• <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.14].</b></li> </ul> <p>An assessment of aviation receptors has been undertaken and instances of yellow glare are possible at RAF Cranwell, Hill Top Farm, Temple Bruer Airfield (Griffins Farm Airfield) and Cottage Farm Airfield and instances of green glare considered to have a low impact are possible at RAF Waddington and Old Manor Farm.</p> <p>Based on the result of the technical assessment, the Applicant considers that the potential for yellow glare is operationally accommodatable at the identified airfields. Prior to submission of the DCO Application, the Applicant has engaged with the Ministry of Defence and</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There are a number of isolated properties within the site that rely on the Air Ambulance as their fastest emergency response.</li></ul>	<p>the Civil Aviation Authority on the results of its Glint and Glare Assessment. This has also involved seeking engagement with three private airfields (of General Aviation use) to understand their operations and discuss the results of the assessment as detailed in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. The Applicant will continue to engage with these airfields following submission of the Application. The Applicant is in ongoing engagement with the MOD regarding the outcomes noted at RAF Cranwell. While the potential for yellow glare occurs outside of its published operating hours of flying, the Applicant shared the results of its Glint and Glare Assessment and continues to welcome further engagement to discuss the assessment in more detail.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.10.159 of NPS EN-3 advises that “<i>while there is some evidence that glint and glare from solar farms can be experienced by pilots and air traffic controllers in certain conditions, there is no evidence that glint and glare from solar farms results in significant impairment on aircraft safety</i>”. EN-3 further advises that it is unlikely that the SoS will give more than limited weight to “<i>claims of aviation</i>”</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Heat and Radiation - The scale of the solar farm is extensive and indeed unprecedented. The expansive volume of PV panel arrays with battery storage units and substations (also emitting heat from cooling systems) will inevitably create its own microclimate. The geographic extent of this must be determined. In combination with the free draining quality of the heathland soils, it has potential to cause failure of proposed mitigating landscaping measures due to heat stress and this could easily impact crops grown within adjacent land. Increased heat and change of environment might also prove harmful to local flora and fauna which could in turn be detrimental to pollinating insects and the life cycle of many species. In addition, the potential for localised temperature rises due to heat radiating from the installation, could also negatively affect local residents (health and amenity concerns). The impact of heat and radiation should therefore be 'scoped in' to the EIA. The potential impact also feeds into considerations of human health (section 5.6), the scope of which needs to be expanded accordingly and included within the EIA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the black surfaces of solar panels absorb most of the sunlight that reaches them, only a fraction (around 15 percent) of that incoming energy gets converted to electricity. The rest is returned to the environment as heat. The panels are usually much darker than the ground they cover, so a vast expanse of solar cells will absorb a lot of additional energy and emit it as heat, affecting the climate.</li> <li>• In a recent study, Pavao-Zuckerman, lead author Greg Barron-Gafford of the University of Arizona School of Geography and Development, and their research colleagues recently published their findings in the journal Nature Scientific Reports in a paper titled "The Photovoltaic Heat Island Effect: Larger solar power plants increase local temperatures." For this study, the</li> </ul>	<p><i>interference because of glint and glare from solar farms”.</i></p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate has agreed that heat and radiation can be scoped out of further assessment, on the basis that it is not anticipated that there will be any significant sources of heat or radiation during either construction, operation (including maintenance) or decommissioning. <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines sources of heat and how this has influenced the design. This includes the spacing of BESS containers to avoid overheating, inclusion of Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems within each BESS unit and inclusion of a separation distance of 0.5m to 1m between cables within the trench to avoid overheating. . Sources of heat and radiation have not influenced the Site selection.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>team defined the heat island effect as the difference in ambient air temperature around the solar power plant compared to that of the surrounding landscape. Findings demonstrated that temperatures around a solar power plant were 5.4-7.2 °F (3-4 °C) warmer. The result demonstrates that there are potential heat costs to generating green power and should be investigated further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is crucial that attention be brought to the recent battery explosion in Liverpool (supported by multiple sources including solarpowerportal.co.uk, energy-storage, News reports and many major media platforms). The explosion at the BESS facility at Carnegie Road, Liverpool was a result of a failure within one of the battery racks in one container which led to a thermal runaway which in turn produced gases within the container culminating in a large explosion with parts of the container being blown across the compound to a distance of 23m. The main fire took 6 hours to bring under control but the continual recycling of heat from the Li-ion batteries remained an issue and defensive fire-fighting continued on-site for a total of 59 hours. The fire and explosion were deemed to have been caused by the failure of one or more battery units, but the root cause of the battery failure remains unknown. The report stated there was a significant risk to emergency responders. Battery safety is a serious consideration which should be thoroughly investigated before mitigating factors can be applied.</li> <li>• Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue need to be consulted regarding this factor to ensure they have both the manpower and resources to tackle any such emergency and to ensure an action plan is created / plausible</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant is committed to developing a battery storage facility that will provide safe, dependable operation and has consulted the local fire and rescue service, Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service as part of developing the battery storage element of the Proposed Development. Prior to commencement of the construction of the BESS (Battery Energy Storage System), an emergency response plan will be prepared by the Applicant in consultation with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service and other relevant stakeholders. This will be maintained and reviewed regularly throughout the operating life of the BESS. The plan will be developed in accordance with National Fire Chief Council guidance, other guidance and best practice in place at the time.</p> <p>To manage the potential impact of firewater associated with the BESS, a tanker would be required to remove</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple</b></p>	<p>Utilities - There is a need to consult Connexin.</p>	<p>firewater and so preventing the release of firewater to the surrounding environment. The procedures for managing the firewater and mitigating any impact to the environment will be documented within and secured by the <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> and requirements for the control and safety of the BESS are documented and secured within the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.14]</b>.</p> <p>Further detail on battery safety and fire risk (including toxic gases) in relation to the battery storage is included within the <b>BESS Plume Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.19]</b>.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> includes the proposed BESS compounds parameters, including the fire safety infrastructure.</p> <p>Noted. Whilst conducting our research for the Proposed Development, Connexin haven't been identified as a party with an interest in the land nor has any landowner identified them as a third-party interest.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>High Grange Parish Council</b></p>		<p>However, we have made contact with Connexin and provided them with the project context. Response from Connexin is to be received at the time of writing this response (October 2024).</p>
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No mention of the well-being and mental health implications of any aspect of the project; noise, privacy, vibration, visual impact, traffic, air pollution and physical health.</li> <li>• To be completely surrounded by an industrialised landscape can have nothing but a detrimental effect on residents' mental health.</li> <li>• Whilst 'property value' is not usually classed as a material consideration, feedback from local residents has been significant in this respect. The implications of such should be considered within the scope of human health:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The development will create huge stress for residents wishing to sell their property with property prices and potential buyers both likely to be significantly decreased.</li> <li>❖ Worries associated with the consequences of decreased property value: less financial stability, less inheritance for children, owners less able to financially help children with first home/university etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The report must take into account the possible risk to health, both during construction and long term, from magnetic fields and radiation (such as childhood cancer risk) to the huge increase in traffic during construction (such as residents with existing cardio pulmonary conditions).</li> <li>• Reassurance and evidence are required to prove that the physical and mental health of local residents and visitors will not be impacted by the proposal.</li> <li>• A lack of data covering a 40-year period, plus the lack of a comparable sized solar farm, is extremely worrying in this regard.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Consideration of potential human health impacts of the Proposed Development are covered through the findings of other assessments undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment process, such as air quality, landscape and visual, noise and vibration and traffic and transport.</p> <p>Published research and evidence to date in consideration of property values and large-scale solar development has not provided any conclusive evidence</p> <p>The Applicant has developed the design of the Proposed Development to incorporate appropriate offsets to local settlements. The Applicant's approach to designing the Proposed Development is set out in the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>This has formed part of the iterative design and Environmental Impact Assessment</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>process and is assessed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.5: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>As a result of the offsets that have been incorporated into the Proposed Development, the landscape and visual assessment confirms that the development would not impact the character of local settlements (Scopwick, Blankney, Kirkby Green, RAF Digby and Ashby de la Launde) and would not be visible from any locations within them except for potentially glimpsed views from RAF Digby. Whilst a small number of residential properties would have some view of the Proposed Development, the design approach and mitigation measures proposed ensure the visual effects would not be overbearing at any dwelling</p> <p>An assessment of impacts to public and private residential properties has not been assessed within the ES, in accordance with comments received from PINS presented in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.2: Scoping Opinion [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration, Chapter 13: Population and Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport</b> <b>[EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> have considered the potential effects from the Proposed Development during construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning which relate to human health , as detailed below:</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines the potential impacts air quality and potential impacts on residents wellbeing caused by respiratory conditions.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> considers the impacts on residential amenity and the users of PRow.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines the potential noise impacts, noting that these could have potential impacts on residents wellbeing.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines the potential impacts to users of PRow and permissive paths which could have an impact on mental and physical health and wellbeing.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines potential impacts to amenity or safety (related to fear and intimidation on and by road users) and driver and passenger delay which could have health and wellbeing impacts.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> outlines potential impacts of glint and glare that could cause nuisance to people living in nearby residential properties. .</p> <p>Likely significant effects to human health are not expected as a result of the Proposed Development.</p>
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development will significantly reduce recreational use (not increase it, as insinuated in the proposal). Even if reinstated, it is very unlikely that anyone will want to use PRow between fields full of panels and deer fencing.</li> <li>• The Planning Inspectorate's report on the refusal of a solar Farm in Alfreton, Derbyshire included the buzzing created would distract from the</li> </ul>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> addresses the temporary closures of the Public Right of Way that would be required to construct the Proposed Development.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>enjoyment of walkers using the footpaths and possibly be heard at night by residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence is needed that people will continue to use footpaths, cycle and ride in an industrial landscape. Currently scoped out and justification and dismissed – inclusion needed.</li> <li>• Feedback from local residents supports the above unanimously.</li> </ul>	<p>An <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b> has been submitted in support of the Development Consent Order application. The plan includes a schedule of Public Rights of Way within the Site and outlines proposed measures to manage or temporarily close Public Rights of Way within the study area during construction. The Public Rights of Way considered within the assessments was discussed with Lincolnshire County Council highways and Public Rights of Way officers and qualitative assessment and proposals were agreed exclusive of surveys, as a representative assessment considered the type of route in question across the Order Limits rather than number of users. For example, the Spires and Steeples Trail is a route of high local importance and as such, impact on users of this route could be more acutely felt than other outlier PRow within the Order Limits. The measures and proposals are outlined in the <b>Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [EN010149/APP/2.4]</b> and the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b>.</p>

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

The Proposed Development includes proposals to provide four new PRoW and four permissive paths, as well as improvements to existing PRoW including improvements to accessibility, increased recreational opportunities and improved connectivity. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]** provides an assessment of effects on walkers, cyclists and horse riders as a result of temporary impacts to Public Rights of Way. Results from the assessment identified that the new PRoW and improvements to existing PRoW including improvements to accessibility would have a beneficial effect on users of the PRoW as it will enhance their wellbeing and quality of life.

Independent Outdoor Equipment (transformer, switchgear and central inverters) and ITS will be offset at least 50m from all existing and proposed statutory PRoW.

An assessment of noise levels at night has been undertaken as detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010149/APP/6.1]**. An adopted criteria of 35 dB *L<sub>A</sub>*, 15minute at all the sensitive receptors has been assessed which has been agreed with North Kesteven District Council.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using the term “within the site boundary” is an inaccurate way of deciding if businesses will be affected. The impact ‘outside of the site boundary’ has been ignored completely. Venues off all kinds for miles around, will undoubtedly see a reduction in business.</li> <li>• Tourism will be adversely affected. It is highly likely to be a reduction of occupancy in hospitality venues when construction is complete, which has not been mentioned.</li> <li>• People will venture out for the day to enjoy the countryside, not however a solar farm.</li> <li>• A development of the nature and scale will have a tangible socio-economic impact upon surrounding businesses and the propensity for people to visit/engage in countryside recreation. It is reasonable to anticipate that the visual impact will prove detrimental to the character of wider locality (land within the development’s anticipated zone of visual influence and surroundings), which will in turn prove damaging to local businesses that benefit from tourism/countryside recreation. Significant research and justification are needed in this area.</li> <li>• The suggested socio-economic benefits have not been properly investigated or justified; there are no shops to benefit. The area is agricultural and as such, the “temporary benefit to local economy” referred to in the document is inaccurate.</li> <li>• The socio-economic consequences of the development should be examined more broadly.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed methodology for assessing impacts to businesses was proposed in the Scoping Report and confirmed in the Scoping Opinion received from PINS <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.2: Scoping Opinion [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. The assessment included the potential impacts to businesses within the Order Limits only, an assessment of impacts to businesses beyond the Order Limits has not been included. This approach was agreed by PINS in the Scoping Opinion and thus impacts to businesses was scoped out of further assessment.</p> <p>An assessment of impacts to tourism has been addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The Applicant has fully assessed impacts to tourism and impacts to occupancy rates as a result of the Proposed Development. There will be no significant effects on occupancy rates of local accommodation providers during the construction or operational phase and therefore there will be no impact on these hospitality and tourist businesses.</p> <p>Furthermore, assessment of impacts on tourism has been undertaken in</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>accordance with findings in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, intervisibility between tourism and recreation assets and the Proposed Development is likely to be the main influence on visitor experiences of the area.</p>
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no data outlining the “power size/output” of the panels, battery storage and inverters.</li> <li>• The guidelines referenced in the report (REF 5-11) also contain information about studies linking magnetic fields with cancer, specifically childhood cancer and leukaemia. These findings need to be thoroughly reported on.</li> <li>• The guidelines referenced are 25 years old and whilst may still be relevant regarding electrical power lines, there is no mention whatsoever of solar or PV panels. Due to the changes and advances in technology, these guidelines are not adequate to warrant scoping out E, M, EMF. More studies and investigations are needed to ensure the long term safety of residents and produce a safe and more accurate report. This should especially apply to fields in close proximity to residential properties where there will be almost constant exposure.</li> <li>• Are there any studies on the dangers of exposure for 40 years? What level of research and insurances have been taken to date to ensure health safety? What level of assurances can local residents expect?</li> <li>• If this factor is not deemed worthy of inclusion within the scoping document, why does the inclusion of plans to have “ongoing consultation with RAF Digby to avoid any interference with their operations” remain, especially considering there is a buffer zone around the camp.</li> </ul>	<p>Details related to the design of the panels, BESS and inverters can be found within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The Proposed Development equates to an output of 1MW per 2.4 acres which represents an efficient use of the land for solar PV and associated infrastructure within the range identified at paragraph 2.10.17 of NPS EN-3.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is not anticipated to exceed the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection exposure guidelines. The design of the Proposed Development has considered any infrastructure constraints. The <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b> outlines how the design has been embedded to the Proposed Development and considers the</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 48 months of construction traffic whilst temporary could have an adverse effect on residents with cardio pulmonary conditions as well as a potential increased risk of childhood asthma and should be added to the report.</li> <li>• “Given the nature of the Proposed Development, no site activities resulting in significant emissions to air are anticipated during operation” Surely this is incorrect, more research is needed regarding the number of vehicles needed to build the site.</li> <li>• Accurate data needs to be provided in order to calculate the possible environmental impact of diesel emissions, dust, fumes etc.</li> <li>• Quoting The British Heart Foundation: “When you breathe in poor quality air, the air pollutants can travel deep into your bloodstream through your lungs, and to your heart. This can damage blood vessels by making them narrower and harder, increasing the risk of developing heart and circulatory diseases”.</li> <li>• Reassurances urgently required.</li> </ul>	<p>location of the 400kV Grid Connection cable, in relation to sensitive receptors.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> includes an assessment of likely significant effects arising from the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of the Proposed Development upon Air Quality, including impacts on residents wellbeing caused by respiratory conditions. Results from the assessment concluded that impacts caused by dust and particulate matter emission during construction and decommissioning phases, including the operation of construction equipment after the implementation of additional mitigation measures is considered to be not significant.</p> <p>Construction and decommissioning phases baseline monitoring is proposed to be commence at least three months before work commences on Site and will be secured by the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> and the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>Dust flux, or real-time PM10 continuous monitoring locations would be agreed with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council.</p> <p>Given the nature of the Proposed Development, there will only be limited movement of vehicles to the Site for operation and maintenance. A screening level assessment against the Environmental Protection UK-Institute of Air Quality Management 2017 guidance and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 Air Quality screening criteria has been undertaken and detailed within the <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 6.2: Air Quality Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> which confirms that there will not be any significant effect on air quality during operation.</p>
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data from the PEA must reflect monitoring location rather than being representative of populations on the whole site. There would likely have been a lot more recording if this project had been known about. If more widespread monitoring had commenced at the time of the PEA (April and May 2022) the results would be very different.</li> </ul>	<p>A biodiversity assessment is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. Since the PEIR, further surveys were carried out in 2023/2024 including: wintering birds, breeding barn owls,</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development has the potential to result in the direct loss of habitat needs of protected and notable species. A significant number of extra surveys are required including a year-round ecological survey covering mating, nesting/breeding, migration and habitat at the very least.</li> <li>• Natural England recommends the avoidance of solar developments in or near to areas of high ecological value. The area proposed has numerous endangered species, for example; residents have reported multiple sightings of brown hares and many species of deer (including a white stag). In the same report it was stated that “the lack of evidence available relating to the ecological impact of solar farms is concerning”.</li> <li>• Government legislation for an EIA (legislation.gov.uk) requires a ‘description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed development and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the development on the environment’ There is no mention of this in the scoping report; this needs to be included.</li> </ul>	<p>targeted bat surveys, riparian mammal, hedgerow surveys, arable plant and LWS grassland surveys. The scope of surveys undertaken was agreed with the North Kesteven District Council ecologist.</p> <p>The surveys carried out follow best practice guidelines, are considered sufficient survey effort and without significant limitation. Agreement has been sought with Natural England and the North Kesteven District Council ecologist regarding the scope of surveys and consultation was undertaken on an ongoing basis to secure agreement on survey scope and method. Further information regarding consultation can be found within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Data results from further species or habitat specific surveys are included within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendices 7.2 - 7.13 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>The design has sought to avoid habitats of high ecological value and enhance/or create habitats where possible to mitigate habitat loss and provide benefit to priority and notable species.</p>

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

Strategic fencing design will enable access across the site for animals including deer, brown hares, hedgehogs and badgers for foraging and dispersal.

Embedded mitigation measures and additional mitigation will be secured within the **Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4], Works Plans [EN010149/APP/2.3], Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7], Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10], Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13] and Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9].**

**ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN01049/APP/6.1]** sets out the alternatives considered, including details on the design alternatives that have been undertaken, factors that have been considered, and the main reasons for discounting alternative design options.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Government legislation relating to scoping reports (legislation.gov.uk), requires the inclusion of the appraisal of alternative reasonable options, together with justification for the chosen option; taking into account the impact on the local environment. This requirement is lacking and needs to be included.</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> presents the alternatives considered, including details on the design alternatives that have been undertaken, factors that have been considered, and the main reasons for discounting alternative design options.</p> <p>The relevant legislation and policy tests are presented in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>There is no reference to cost v benefits analysis, nor justification in respect of the use of alternative Off Shore Wind Turbines (research highlights off shore wind turbines are a favoured alternative, due to increased productively, lower costs per unit and reduced impact).</p> <p>Ref. Regan Power 'The wind is a more efficient power source than solar. Wind turbines release less CO2 to the atmosphere. A wind turbine produces 4.64 grams of CO2/1kWh while the solar panel produces 70 grams of CO2/1kWh. Wind power consumes less energy and produces more energy compared to solar panels. By comparison with off-shore wind, solar farms are hugely inefficient. • A 140-acre solar park is said to be capable of supplying electricity to about 9,000 homes. One wind turbine in the North Sea has the capacity to power 16,000 homes. • In terms of efficiency rating i.e., the amount of power exported to the grid, solar's rating is between 11 and 15% whereas for off-shore wind the figure is 50%+. • On one day last year it has been reported that 78% of the UK's electricity came from off-shore wind.</p>	<p>The alternatives considered have been presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>, which also demonstrates the alignment of the Proposed Development with stated government policy that has identified solar is a key component of UK policy goals.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> addresses socio-economic impacts including economic benefits as a result of the Proposed Development.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>All costs need to be incorporated, including the costs associated with importing additional food products, shielding, lighting, maintenance, security etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact on local residents has been dismissed, alarmingly so. The impact will be huge, with an array of differing implications, including disruption, traffic, visual impact, noise, vibration, light pollution and health. Significant consideration of all impacts affecting local residents is required.</li> <li>• Security implications – CCTV, lighting, fencing etc. How will this affect local residents?</li> <li>• The welfare of horses and livestock should be scoped into the document.</li> <li>• Affecting the quality of life for our serving RAF personnel in Digby, is unacceptable for many reasons, including mental health issues and the ability to recruit.</li> </ul>	<p>We recognise the importance of fully assessing potential impacts on local residents, including disruption, traffic, visual impact, noise, vibration, light pollution, and health. The ES provides a comprehensive assessment of these aspects across several chapters, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010149/APP/6.1] -</b> Assesses the potential impacts of dust and emissions from construction and operation, with mitigation measures to minimise air quality effects on local residents.</li> <li>• <b>Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] –</b> Assesses visual impacts, considering how the project might alter views for nearby residents. The design includes embedded screening measures to reduce visibility where possible.</li> </ul>

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

- **Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010149/APP/6.1]** – Assesses potential noise sources and vibration impacts from construction and operational activities, with recommended mitigation to limit these impacts on local receptors.
- There is little guidance on assessing noise levels to horses, although “Protecting horses from excessive music noise – a case study” by Cornelius (Neil) Huybregts, Marshall Day Acoustics Pty Ltd, recommends levels not to exceed 65 dB  $L_{Aeq}$ , which is significantly higher than the operational noise levels reported at residential receptors and the adopted criteria of 40 dB  $L_{Ar,1hour}$  daytime and 35dB  $L_{Ar,15minute}$  night-time which is secured in **Requirement 15 of the Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1]**.
- **Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]** – Considers health and well-being implications related to the development.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>The impact on local wildlife is currently seriously under represented and needs further inclusion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> – Assesses potential traffic-related impacts during construction, focusing on increases in vehicle numbers, routing, and timing to mitigate disruptions for local communities..</li> <li>• <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> considers the potential effects on residents related to glint and glare.</li> </ul> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> considers the works in connection with and in addition to Works Nos. 1 to 9 fencing, security and ancillary infrastructure, which includes CCTV systems and deer-proof fencing.</p> <p>A biodiversity assessment is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. Data results from further species or habitat specific surveys are included within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendices 7.2 - 7.13 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

Since the PEIR, further surveys were carried out in 2023/2024 including: wintering birds, breeding barn owls, targeted bat surveys, riparian mammal, hedgerow surveys, arable plant and LWS grassland surveys. The scope of the surveys has been agreed with the North Kesteven District Council ecologist. The Project Principles are to avoid habitats of high ecological value and enhance or create habitats where possible to mitigate habitat loss and provide benefit to priority and notable species. Project Principles are outlined within the **Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]**.

The surveys carried out to date are considered sufficient to provide baseline information on the importance of habitats and species on site to enable an informed assessment of impact. Further targeted surveys were carried out once design details were updated to inform the design and mitigation required to avoid significant adverse effects.

Embedded mitigation measures and additional mitigation are secured within the **Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4], Works Plans**



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Natural England recommends the avoidance of solar developments in or near to areas of high ecological value. In the same report it was stated that “the lack of evidence available relating to the ecological impact of solar farms is concerning”. The rural nature of the proposed area, inevitably creates a high ecological value to both humans and nonhumans alike. Inclusion required.</p>	<p><b>[EN010149/APP/2.3], Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7], Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10], Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13] and Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9].</b></p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has sought to avoid habitats of high ecological value and enhance or create habitats where possible to mitigate habitat loss and provide benefit to priority and notable species. The Proposed Development offers opportunities for environmental enhancement related to biodiversity. Project Principles and environmental enhancement opportunities are outlined within the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b> and <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed plans insinuate advantages will be generated by newly created footpaths; however, this is extremely misleading in our view.</li> <li>• Currently there are extensive open views of green fields and agricultural farmland. The development would create significant adverse visual impact along any footpath or bridleway within the area, with arrays of 3 m high</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Development includes proposals to provide four new PRoW and four permissive paths, as well as improvements to existing PRoW including improvements to accessibility, increased</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>dark coloured solar panels which would tower above walkers blocking those views. Any footpath or bridleway would be separated from the site by a high security fence. The solar panels and fencing would destroy the wide, open views and create an unpleasant tunnel along the footpath and bridleway, degrading the amenity value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The solar farm development would turn a pleasant and rural area into an industrialised area, protected by CCTV cameras, lighting, high fencing and warning signs – a far cry from the current beauty of the area.</li> <li>• Detailed analysis of how the proposal meets current planning policy relating to the protection of rights of way, is required.</li> </ul>	<p>recreational opportunities and improved connectivity.</p> <p>New footpaths are part of design principles to provide enhancement of existing area, along with targeted screening for existing footpaths, in conjunction with the Lincolnshire County Council Public Right of Way officers.</p> <p>The design has involved since the EIA Scoping to take account of feedback, which has sought to remove solar panels directly adjacent to Scopwick and to create breaks in the Solar PV development to reduce the impacts on users of PRow. New planting, in the form of hedgerows and tree belts, will provide screening and integration of the Proposed Development where it is located close to PRow. The location of new planting is secured by the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, Appendix 1: Green Infrastructure Parameters [EN01049/APP/7.9]</b> and includes approximately 15,563m of new hedgerow and 16ha of new tree belts.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current road networks are inadequate and would not cope with the increased heavy traffic during development (already overburdened and unsuitable for large vehicles).</li> <li>• Lincolnshire is the only county in the UK without a motorway.</li> <li>• The B1191 (we reiterate the 'B' classification), is already a busy road providing the majority of vehicular access to RAF Digby from the A15.</li> <li>• Lincolnshire County Council already struggle to find funds to repair the roads which become rife with potholes every year, consequently causing issues for motorists and cyclist with damaged tyres and road traffic accidents. Details of how these issues can be managed, if at all, need to be incorporated within the scoping report.</li> <li>• Recognition of the road network limitations, need to be included within the scoping</li> </ul>	<p><b>[EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines the proposals for new Public Rights of Way links, enhancements and new permissive path connections.</p> <p>An assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. This Includes a consideration of visual effects on PRoW. Where possible; plants, hedges and trees will be retained or more will be planted in order to provide a visual barrier close to residential properties and PRoW.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of construction traffic has been undertaken on the road network in a routing assessment undertaken for AIL vehicle movements and used to inform the design development. Pinch points have also been assessed (RAF Digby, Ashby-de-la-Launde) for HGVs (no AIL required in these locations).</p> <p>Changes to speed limits and road markings/other mitigation is proposed along the B1191 and Temple Road. It was found that no alterations were required to the B1188 to facilitate the proposed</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an outstanding collection of older buildings within the vicinity of the site area, many of which are one of a kind, which need to be preserved and protected in their own right. Development of such buildings involve close scrutiny by Heritage England and local planning policies relating to the preservation of historic assets. Associated legislation is both numerous and extensive. The omission of detail in this area within the scoping report is unacceptable and inclusion essential.</li> </ul>	<p>development, as discussed and agreed with LCC Highways.</p> <p>Where necessary, junction mitigation and other minor works have been agreed with the Local Highway Authority. This includes works to allow two-way movement of HGVs across the study area. The assessments indicate that there are no significant residual effects from construction traffic, which are summarised in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>Mitigation measures related to transport have been detailed and secured within the <b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.8]</b> which is submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.</p> <p>All heritage assets within 2km and all designated historic assets within 5km have been included in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> The buffers used for the assessment follow the published guidance from Lincolnshire</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lack of local knowledge in this respect is clearly evident and objectionable on many counts.</li> <li>• The scoping report states that 'whilst there may be glimpse from individual properties over 1km from the site; this does not give rise to an overbearing effect on residential amenity'. We wholeheartedly disagree with this statement. Further research and inclusion required.</li> </ul>	<p>County Council. Likely significant effects to non-designated heritage assets beyond this distance are therefore not predicted.</p> <p>An assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. This includes a consideration of views from residential properties.</p>
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An unacceptable and unprecedented scale – generating overriding harm.</li> <li>• Inappropriate sizing; fundamentally changing the tranquil character of the area.</li> <li>• The unknown consequences of a development of this size, will need major government input and review – it cannot be viewed in the same light as smaller proposals -timescales need to be incorporated for this work to be completed.</li> </ul>	<p>The <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b> details the design process for the Proposed Development, both in terms of good design outcomes and good design as a process.</p> <p>Good design has been embedded to the Proposed Development from the outset of the project via a clear design framework. This includes the evolution and application of Project Principles which have been used to inform the design process. The Project Principles have set the framework of design from the very start of the project and been continually tested and improved in response to further baseline survey work, design evolution, environmental assessment and stakeholder feedback to deliver good outcomes for the project.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</b></p>	<p>We do not believe that the scoping document describes accurately, or fully represents the views of the affected local community.</p> <p>The scoping document is incomplete, dismissive of key impacts and inaccurate in some areas; this is completely unacceptable.</p> <p>There is a critical need to preserve agricultural land and UK food safety.</p> <p>The need to protect the site's productive agricultural land (a finite resource), is undoubtedly of prime importance. Lincolnshire has England's best food producing land – future food security has to be protected. 40 years is not temporary; the argument that the land can be returned to agriculture after decommissioning is misleading (the construction of a solar farm this size and the associated costs involved, make it very unlikely that the site will ever be returned to its' current agricultural use). There is no weight to any claims that the development is temporary and can be reversed.</p> <p>The Loss of productive arable land is disastrous long term, escalating inflation and causing an increased reliance on imported food.</p> <p>We believe there is a policy conflict (where government seeks to protect and enhance our domestic production to maintain food security, while also encouraging the growth of solar energy production). We recognise the need to balance both energy and food security, but solving one problem whilst affecting the other, is NOT the answer.</p> <p>The list of negative impacts is extensive (impact on local residents and wildlife, the industrialisation of the countryside, loss of key agricultural land, the need for increased food imports, lack of adequate road networks, lost</p>	<p>Effects on landscape character are assessed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN10149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Food production can continue at a lesser scale, with sheep grazing in areas beneath/around Solar PV modules, and areas where there is retained agricultural land. The impact on quantities of food produced on a national scale would not be considered to be significant, given the temporary nature of the Proposed Development, and the area of land involved compared to the total area of land in agricultural use in the UK. This was stated to be approximately 17 million hectares in 2023 (National Statistics: Agricultural Land Use in England at 1 June 2023, Defra). Even without further consideration of site specifics, the total Order Limits for the Proposed Development is less than 0.01% of the total UK utilised agricultural area.</p> <p>National Policy Statement EN-1 (2024) states that decentralised and community energy systems, which by definition include rooftop solar installations, could lead to</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>opportunities to enjoy recreation in the area etc. etc.) The adverse effects would demonstrably outweigh any benefits from this scheme; whilst alternative options are available. The scoping document fails to address each and every impact adequately. Indeed, we feel the dismissive nature of key issues (suggesting they are unworthy of attention), denotes deception.</p> <p>Any solar farm developments should be limited to brownfield land and poorer quality unproductive land; located on already industrialised land, on roof tops or adjacent to motorways, not on productive agricultural land, or in an area which will cause significant visual impact to the residents and visitors.</p> <p>Off Shore Wind Turbines offer a favourable solution to energy generation, a view supported by many senior government ministers.</p> <p>All of the villages and hamlets affected, exude an abundance of quintessentially English charm; the cream stone buildings, a rare Victorian walled garden, the open countryside and the abundance of wildlife. The area is popular with walkers, cyclist, pedestrians, and horse riders. This unique beauty represents history with an abundance of older properties, built using local materials, never to be replaced. The need to safeguard this English heritage for future generations is undeniable and absolutely essential. Placing a solar farm next to such valuable heritage assets is not only out of character, but incomprehensible and utterly damaging to the historic landscape. Feedback received to date from local residents, demonstrates the unanimous opposition to the proposal (further details are available if required). All references included within this response, can be provided if required. As Parish Councillors, we feel we have a duty to do all we can to protect our community, agricultural land resource and historical assets</p>	<p>some reduction in demand on the main transmission system, but “the government does not believe they will replace the need for new large-scale electricity infrastructure to meet our energy objectives.” NPS EN-1 goes on to explain that the connection of large-scale generation facilities via high-voltage transmission systems enables the pooling of generation and demand and enables the efficient bulk transfer of power between areas with surplus and areas in deficit [1, Para 3.3.12]. This is a critical benefit of large-scale systems and supports energy security and system operability.</p> <p>Powering Up Britain’s Energy Security Plan confirms that the government’s view is that “We need to maximise deployment of both types of solar to achieve our overall [net zero and energy security] target.”</p> <p><b>The Statement of Need</b> <b>[EN010149/APP/7.1]</b> provides evidence that, on its own, smaller scale solar, including rooftop solar, is not likely to deliver a sufficient total installed capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the government’s net zero and energy security targets. Therefore, smaller scale solar, including rooftop solar, must</p>

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, large-scale solar. The Applicant undertook a systematic process to determine suitable sites. A range of technical, environmental, and economic factors are considered when investigating and assessing any potential site for large-scale solar developments. A Site Selection Report has been prepared and forms Appendix 1 of the **Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]**, which provides an overview of the site selection process undertaken by the Applicant to identify the location of the Proposed Development.

The Applicant has developed the design of the Proposed Development to incorporate appropriate offsets to local settlements, dwellings and historical features and in accordance with the Project Principles set out in the **Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]**.

An assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]**, which includes an assessment on impacts to the PRoW, landscape character and visual impacts.



**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

**ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]** presents an assessment of likely significant effects arising from the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of the Proposed Development upon Population, including potential impacts to users of PRoW, agricultural land holdings and visitors.

**ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]** presents an assessment of likely significant effects arising from the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of the Proposed Development upon lands, soil and groundwater, including agricultural land.

Results from the agricultural land classification has been included within **ES Volume 2, Figure 11.1: Agricultural Land Classification and Figure 11.2: Agricultural Land Classification Overlay [EN010149/APP/6.2]**, and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.1 A to C [EN010149/APP/6.3]**.

The **Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]** demonstrate how the

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>design has been embedded to the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation measures and additional mitigation will be secured within the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4], Works Plans [EN010149/APP/2.3], Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7], Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10], Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13] and Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9].</b></p>
<b>Boston Borough Council</b>		
<b>Boston Borough Council</b>	<p>I write to confirm that the Council has no comments to make on the Scoping Opinion at this time. However, as the scheme progresses the Council would wish to be further consulted. This advice is therefore based upon the information available at this time. Please note that the advice is given without prejudice to any future decision made by the Local Planning Authority upon the receipt of further information.</p>	<p>Noted, further engagement was undertaken during the statutory consultation.</p>
<b>Canal and River Trust</b>		
<b>Canal and River Trust</b>	<p>Having reviewed the location of the project and the relationship of the proposed solar farm and its associated infrastructure with our network, we do not believe that the proposals as shown would cross land owned or</p>	<p>Noted. River Witham is outside of the 1km Study Area around the Order Limits.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>operated by the Trust or impact our interests. Our closest waterway is the River Witham approximately 7 kilometres northeast of the site boundary. Should the scheme be amended to potentially affect the River Witham (or any other of our waterways named above), we would welcome further consultation on the proposals, so that we can advise about any potential impact for our interests.</p>	<p>Given the distance of the River Witham from the Site and the nature of the Proposed Development, no significant effects are anticipated on this waterway. As such, it has not been included within the assessment.</p>
<p><b>City of Lincoln Council</b></p>		
<p><b>City of Lincoln Council</b></p>	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above and I would confirm that the City of Lincoln Council has no comments to make regarding this proposal.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>East Lindsey District Council</b></p>		
<p><b>East Lindsey District Council</b></p>	<p>I can confirm that this authority has no comments to make at this time.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>The Planning Inspectorate Environmental Services</b></p>		
<p><b>The Planning Inspectorate Environmental Services</b></p>	<p>Most of the site boundary sits within Flood Zone 1 – land identified as having a low probability of flooding on the Environment Agency's flood map for planning and the Report shows that essential infrastructure will be located here. There are no river crossings or interaction with embankments or assets.                      We therefore support the proposal to exclude flood risk from the scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), subject to ensuring no increase in flood risk and agreeing design and mitigation measures with us.</p>	<p><b>A Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b> has been submitted as part of the DCO Application which confirms when the Proposed Development is considered in isolation of other developments there are no increases in flood risk. The drainage design is provided within the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy (which forms an appendix to the Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16])</b>, which confirms flood risk is not exacerbated offsite as a result of the Proposed Development. The Applicant would continue to welcome further</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>The Planning Inspectorate Environmental Services</b></p>	<p>Based on the available information, the proposed development area is understood to be predominantly Greenfield in nature. We therefore consider the potential for significant or widespread contamination at the site to be low. Nevertheless, areas of the site boundary are underlain by Principal and Secondary aquifers – geological strata that provide significant quantities of drinking water, water for business needs and support rivers, lakes and wetlands. In addition, a Source Protection Zone (SPZ) is present in the area of the site around Scopwick. This is an inner zone (SPZ1), providing protection around a groundwater abstraction source located to the west of Scopwick. There is also a total catchment zone (SPZ3) located across the southwest section of the site.</p> <p>We therefore support the proposal for land, soils and groundwater to be scoped into the EIA. We understand that a 'desk-based PRA Report has been prepared, which assesses the potential risks on the existing land, soil and groundwater baseline, including contamination issue' (Scoping Report Section 6.6.6) and that this will be used to inform intrusive ground investigations. We agree with this approach, and recommend that developers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Follow the risk management framework provided in 'Land contamination: risk management' when dealing with land affected by contamination</li> <li>2. Refer to our Guiding principles for land contamination for the type of information that we require in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site – the local authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health.</li> <li>3. Consider using the National Quality Mark Scheme for Land Contamination</li> </ol>	<p>engagement on potential opportunities of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Desk based preliminary risk appraisal has been undertaken and is presented in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.2: Preliminary Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. An assessment of land, soils and groundwater is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The PRA follows the framework presented in 'Land contamination: risk management' and refers to the 'Guiding principles for land contamination', as well as relevant sections of the guidance presented on the contaminated land pages on the gov.uk website.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>The Planning Inspectorate Environmental Services</b></p>	<p>Management which involves the use of competent persons to ensure that land contamination risks are appropriately managed            4. Refer to the contaminated land pages on gov.uk for more information</p> <p>The site boundary sits in the catchment of the 'Bringing the Limestone Becks Back to Life' project. The project is a successful collaboration between East Mercia Rivers Trust, the Environment Agency, and the Wild Trout Trust and aims to improve and protect Lincolnshire's limestone becks from deterioration. Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement that support the ambition of the project should therefore be sought.</p>	<p>The 'Bringing the Limestone Becks Back to Life' project has been discussed with the Environment Agency in our initial engagement.</p> <p>Consideration is embedded in the design of the Proposed Development to contribute to aims of 'Bringing the Limestone Becks Back to Life' project. For example, buffer zones to protect watercourses; conversion of arable to grassland to reduce run-off; and reduction in pesticide and fertiliser use which would also enhance water quality. Opportunities for environmental enhancement in relation to biodiversity are detailed in the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b> and <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>
<p><b>The Planning Inspectorate Environmental Services</b></p>	<p>Should the Applicant wish us to review any technical documents or want further advice to address the environmental issues, we can do this as part of our charged for service. Further engagement at the pre-application stage will speed up our formal response to their application and provide them with certainty as to what our response to the Development Consent Order application will be. It should also result in better quality and more environmentally sensitive development. As part of our charged for service,</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>we will provide a dedicated project manager to act as a single point of contact to help resolve any problems. We currently charge £100 per hour, plus VAT. The terms and conditions of our charged for service are available at <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-and-marine-licence-advice/standard-terms-for-our-charges">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-and-marine-licence-advice/standard-terms-for-our-charges</a>.</p>	
<b>Forestry Commission</b>		
<p><b>Forestry Commission</b></p>	<p>As the Governments forestry experts, we endeavour to provide as much relevant information to enable the project to reduce any impact on irreplaceable habitat such as Ancient Semi Natural woodland, as well as other woodland.</p> <p>We are satisfied there is no Ancient Woodland within the development area. However, there are numerous small fragmented woodlands within the development area.</p> <p>We note the scoping report suggests woodland creation will be undertaken to connect woodlands and enhance wildlife corridors and that there are no plans to remove any existing trees or woodlands.</p> <p>We would recommend that planting should be targeted to enhance existing woodland and ecological networks by buffering the existing woodland to create larger blocks of ideally at least 5ha. Species and provenance of new trees and woodland need to be considered to establish a more resilient treescape which can cope with the full implications of a changing climate. When planting new trees and woodland, ensure that biosecurity is robust to avoid the introduction of pests and diseases. Details should be provided of how the existing trees and woodlands will be protected during the construction phase, protection measures can include taking care not to cut tree roots or causing soil compaction around trees (e.g., through vehicle movements or stacking heavy equipment) or contamination from poisons. Access to the woodlands should also be considered for future</p>	<p>Noted. Most woodland has now been excluded from the Order Limits, except for two small areas of broadleaved woodland. These woodlands would be protected by minimum 15m. The buffer zones from habitats including hedgerows and trees are documented in and secured in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>. An <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> and <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> have been produced and secured within the Development Consent Order Application. These detail requirements to ensure the trees and hedgerows will be protected, biosecurity measures and outline the future management of the landscape and biodiversity enhancements throughout the operational phase. Proposals include creation of 16 new tree belts in strategic locations to buffer and extend existing woodland, although it was</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	management, as woodland management will improve and maintain biodiversity.	not possible to commit to create larger woodland blocks of 5ha.
<b>HSE</b>		
<b>HSE</b>	<p>According to HSE's records, the proposed DCO Application boundary for this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project falls into a small part of the outer zone of a Major Accident Hazard Pipeline at a single location. This is based on the site boundary in Appendix A of "EN010149-000006-EN010149 - Scoping Report.pdf" downloaded from <a href="http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/EN010149-000006">http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/EN010149-000006</a>.</p> <p>The major accident hazard pipeline is operated by National Grid Gas Plc and has the ref number 2704. The Applicant should make contact with the above operator, to inform an assessment of whether or not the proposed development is vulnerable to a possible major accident. There are three particular reasons for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The pipeline operator may have a legal interest in developments in the vicinity of the pipeline. This may restrict developments within a certain proximity of the pipeline.</li> <li>2. The standards to which the pipeline is designed and operated may restrict major traffic routes within a certain proximity of the pipeline. Consequently, there may be a need for the operator to modify the pipeline or its operation, if the development proceeds.</li> <li>3. To establish the necessary measures required to alter/upgrade the pipeline to appropriate standards.</li> </ol> <p>HSE's Land Use Planning advice is dependent on the location of areas where people may be present. Based on the information in the Scoping Report "EN010149-000006-EN010149 - Scoping Report.pdf", it is unlikely that HSE would advise against the development</p>	<p>Noted. National Gas Transmission has been consulted and has confirmed that they are not impacted by the project and no protective provisions are required. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
HSE	<p>Based on <a href="http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/EN010149-000006">http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/EN010149-000006</a>, it is not clear whether the applicant has considered the hazard classification of any chemicals that are proposed to be present at the development. Hazard classification is relevant to the potential for accidents. For example, hazardous substances planning consent is required to store or use any of the Categories of Substances or Named Hazardous Substances set out in Schedule 1 of The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended, if those hazardous substances will be present on, over or under the land at or above the controlled quantities. There is an addition rule in the Schedule for below-threshold substances. If hazardous substances planning consent is required, please consult HSE on the application.</p>	<p>No hazardous substances or hazardous substances planning consent are required.</p>
HSE	<p>Regulation 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the proposed development's vulnerability to major accidents. HSE's role in NSIPs is summarised in Advice Note 11 'working with public bodies in the infrastructure planning process' Annex G on the Planning Inspectorate's website [Advice notes   National Infrastructure Planning (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)] - Annex G – The Health and Safety Executive. This document includes consideration of risk assessments under the heading "Risk assessments".</p>	<p>The risk of major accidents and disasters has been considered throughout the design process of the Proposed Development. This includes siting the potentially hazardous equipment, such as the BESS and grid infrastructure, at a suitable distance from sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Consideration of the risks associated with major accidents and disasters have been included in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. No significant effects in relation to major accidents and disasters are anticipated during the construction,</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>Impacts of major accidents and disasters are considered within <b>the BESS Plume Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.19]</b> and <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, with any relevant mitigation measures secured within the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>, <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> and <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.14]</b> which are submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.</p> <p>The <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b> demonstrate how the design has been embedded to the Proposed Development.</p>
HSE	HSE has no comment to make as there are no licensed explosives sites in the vicinity.	Noted.
HSE	No comment from a planning perspective.	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Historic England Advice</b>		
<b>Historic England Advice</b>	Numerous cropmark features plotted in the National Mapping Programme suggestive of quite busy late prehistoric – Romano British landscape	<p>The Applicant considers that the Desk-based assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> Aerial Investigation and Mapping (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.3 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>), Geoarchaeological Deposit Modelling (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.2 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>), Geophysical Surveys (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.4 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>) and targeted Trial Trenching (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>) together provide sufficient information on the archaeological potential of the Site and likely impacts resulting from changes to the setting of heritage assets to inform the application.</p> <p>These evaluation methods have identified areas of archaeological interest including possible settlement which have been considered in the ES. An <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> has been prepared setting out the proposed strategy for further evaluation at detailed design stage and mitigation measures for known heritage assets.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Historic England Advice</b>	Undesignated NHRE asset ref 349061 to NE of Kingfisher Court - Probable Prehistoric or Roman settlement consisting of enclosures and a trackway seen as cropmarks.	This has been noted.
<b>Historic England Advice</b>	Undesignated NHRE asset ref:1061192 - Mareham Lane Roman road running from Bourne to Lincoln via Sleaford, partly covered by modern road and part surviving as cropmarks and in parish boundaries – and associated features.	This has been noted.
<b>Historic England Advice</b>	Undesignated NHRE asset ref: 1061215 - Probable Roman Road (and associated remains) between Sleaford and Lincoln on the line of the A15 + GII listed Milepost 1061824	This has been noted.
<b>Historic England Advice</b>	Undesignated remains associated with former RAF Digby aka RAF Scopwick	This has been noted.
<b>Historic England Advice</b>	Undesignated crop marks NHRE asset ref 1057715 – south of Ash Holt Probable Prehistoric or Roman rectangular and square enclosures seen as cropmarks	This has been noted.
<b>Historic England Advice</b>	Undesignated find spot NHRE ref 349439 – Four Cinerary Urns and late Roman Coin found near site of Brickyard Farm	This has been noted.
<b>Historic England Advice</b>	We welcome reference to geophysical survey and trial trenching	This has been noted.
<b>Historic England Advice</b>	Solar schemes present risk to buried archaeological remains through panel fixing, cabling, substations, fencing, biodiversity features etc, these impacts can be effectively managed through a sound process of archaeological assessment with a particular focus upon the identification areas of highest or uncertainty through desk-based assessment or HER, Portable Antiquities Scheme and cartographic data, aerial photography, lidar and geophysical survey and deposit modelling. Whilst large scale solar schemes have relatively high degrees of elasticity (when compared to say	<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> has included consideration of Portable Antiquities Scheme, pre-history and history including military heritage and cartographic data; the Aerial Investigation and Mapping report

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>housing or quarry schemes) this potential to deploy open areas of grass (exclusion zones) or differential support schemes (concrete shoes rather than piles) or cable avoidance routes / sensitive location of substations / habitat ponds etc, all these are only effective where one has a robust understanding of archaeological risk. The sooner and better these understandings can be achieved the better risks will be managed. Whilst micro piling a ploughed flat iron-age field system might appear a low impact the same could not be said of an early medieval burial ground or Roman Villa, hence iterative process of investigation is necessary to characterise features revealed through non-intrusive survey and to test apparent blank areas. In the case of 20th century military remains you should contact the Ministry of Defence for advice and it is likely that specialist survey techniques and methodology and UXO survey may be needed.</p>	<p>has reviewed aerial photography and LiDAR and a geophysical survey has been carried out. A phase of targeted archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) has also informed the ES. This included trenches in the area of the WWII crash sites carried out in accordance with a licence obtained from the MoD.</p> <p>The design has sought to minimise impacts on the WWII crash sites, and no harm to the significance of the listed structures at RAF Digby will occur either through construction or through changes to their setting during the operational phase of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Archaeological Desk-based Assessment, Aerial Investigation Report, Geophysical survey and trial trenching results are provided in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Appendix 9.3: Aerial Investigation Report, Appendix 9.4: Geophysical Survey, Appendix 9.5: Trial Trenching Report [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>		
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	<p>Two options are currently being considered for the mounting structure e.g. single axis tracker or tracker platform. This suggests that a fixed mounting system is not being proposed and the Inspectorate is invited to clarify this. In the event that a fixed mounting structure is proposed then the ES and all relevant assessments will need to also consider the impacts of this option. If not, the ES will in any case need to assess both options and any potential impacts arising from each (e.g. noise, glint and glare, landscape and visual impacts, etc) until or unless a decision is taken on which option would be used in advance of completing the ES.</p>	<p>A detailed UXO assessment has been undertaken and is presented in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.3: Detailed UXO Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	<p>Different configuration options currently being considered for the inverters, transformers and switchgears. The ES will need to assess all options being considered at this stage (e.g. string or centralised inverters; independent outdoor or contained indoor equipment) and any potential impacts arising from each of these (e.g. noise, landscape and visual impact, etc) until or unless a decision is taken on which option would be used in advance of completing the ES.</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines the reasonable alternatives that have been considered by the Applicant for the Proposed Development to date, including design options.</p> <p>Four alternative locations were identified that met the Applicant's initial site search criteria (as set out in Section 3 of the Site Selection Report at <b>Appendix 1</b> to the <b>Planning Statement [EN01049/APP/7.2]</b>. However, Blankney Estate land performed</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	Two options being considered at this stage which include consolidated or distributed BESS. The ES will need to assess all options being considered at this stage (e.g. string or centralised inverters; independent outdoor or contained indoor equipment) and any potential impacts arising from each of these (e.g. noise, landscape and visual impact, etc) until or unless a	<p>strongly against the Applicant's search criteria and discussions with the estate advanced sufficiently for the Applicant to have confidence that the project objectives could be delivered and, once agreement with the landowner was in place, the Applicant received its grid connection offer. It is worthy of note that the Applicant is required to justify its choice of site and the robustness of the site selection process and decision making but not required to "<i>establish whether the proposed project represents the best option from a policy perspective</i>" (para. 4.3.9 of NPS EN-1).</p> <p>The Site Selection Report, Appendix 1 of the <b>Planning Statement [EN01049/APP/7.2]</b> explains the process which has resulted in the Site being selected including which criteria were used in site selection and how the site selection process performs against the key requirements of NPS EN-3.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> presents the alternatives considered, including details on the design alternatives that have been</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>decision is taken on which option would be used in advance of completing the ES.</p>	<p>undertaken, factors that have been considered, and the main reasons for discounting alternative design options.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed potential impacts of the Proposed Development during the construction, operational (including maintenance) and decommissioning phases across all topic chapters (Chapters 6-17) within the <b>Environmental Statement [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Several potential locations identified and so all options will need to be assessed. The NGC and TT will be permanent features and not decommissioned and removed at the end of the project period (40 years) like the 'temporary' PV solar park. Therefore the EIA and assessments will need to make a clear distinction between those impacts which it might view as temporary (e.g. the PV park) and those which would be permanent (e.g. the NGC and TT)</p>	<p>The National Grid Navenby Substation and National Grid connecting towers no longer form part of the Proposed Development.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>States that the NGC compound, Project Substation compound, BESS compounds, and Collector Compounds would include lighting, in accordance with relevant standards, but will not be permanently lit. Whether scoped in or out of the ES, external lighting should be assessed in a lighting assessment to include consideration of glare, glow, lux levels and consideration of Environmental Zone (ILE standards) source intensity levels relative to the countryside location of the site.</p>	<p>This has been noted regarding agreement with the Applicant's approach and assessment in the Bat Activity Survey report. Further details on the bat activity surveys can be found within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.5 Bat Activity Survey, 7.6: Bat Activity Survey Addendum</b> and</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p><b>Appendix: 7.13 Further Targeted Bat Activity Survey [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b></p> <p>Lighting has been considered to minimise light spill to prevent disturbance to bats and other nocturnal animals. Throughout construction and operation, the use of motion detection or manually operated lighting would be used to avoid constant lighting. Security lighting would use infra-red which is not on the visible spectrum for bats. The lighting design is secured in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149APP/7.4]</b> and discussed in the <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>The location of potential borrow pits will need to be identified and must be included within the proposed Order Limits of the development and an assessment of impacts, including cumulative effects, arising from the working and restoration of identified borrow pits included as part of the ES.</p>	<p>No borrow pits are proposed as part of the Proposed Development.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>The Council agrees that a consideration of alternatives should be presented. Reasonable alternatives include different layouts, scales, technologies adopted, design parameters as well as different sites. The ES should explain in detail what criteria have been used to identify the chosen option and explain what criteria have been applied as well as reasons why other alternatives have been dismissed.</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines the reasonable alternatives that have been considered by the Applicant for the Proposed Development to date, including design options.</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	In regard to alternative sites, this is particularly key as the proposal includes the creation of a new NGC in order to connect into the 400kV overhead powerline network. A new NGC could potentially be constructed to give access to any other 400kV powerline network and so the ES will need to explain and justify why this site has been chosen over potential alternative sites/locations. Alternative sites/locations could therefore include anywhere along the same 400kV powerline route/corridor and so	<p>Four alternative locations were identified that met the Applicant's initial site search criteria (as set out in Section 3 of the Site Selection Report at <b>Appendix 1</b> to the <b>Planning Statement [EN01049/APP/7.2]</b>. However, Blankney Estate land performed strongly against the Applicant's search criteria and discussions with the estate advanced sufficiently for the Applicant to have confidence that the project objectives could be delivered and, once agreement with the landowner was in place, the Applicant received its grid connection offer.</p> <p>The Site Selection Report, Appendix 1 of the <b>Planning Statement [EN01049/APP/7.2]</b> explains the process which has resulted in the Site being selected including which criteria were used in site selection and how the site selection process performs against the key requirements of NPS EN-3.</p> <p>The National Grid Navenby Substation no longer forms part of the Proposed Development. National Grid will be submitting a separate planning application for this development.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>include sites elsewhere within the District as well as within the County and even nationally given this is a 'national infrastructure project' and therefore locational need factors are not relevant and any other 400kV powerline network could potentially act as a connection point for a new NGC</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> outlines the reasonable alternatives that have been considered by the Applicant for the Proposed Development to date, including design options.</p> <p>Further detail is presented in the Site Selection Report which forms Appendix 1 of the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>The assessment of alternative sites should also consider the scope for connection into existing National Grid connection points currently in existence (like those proposed by other registered NSIP solar projects currently being promoted within the County) and explain why connection or upgrade of these to facilitate connection has been dismissed.</p>	<p>Further detail in regards to the Site Selection and National Grid connection is detailed in the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>It is accepted the list of consultees is not a definitive list however it is recommended that identified consultees include Navenby Parish Council, RAF Waddington, RAF Cranwell and Internal Drainage Boards.</p>	<p>Noted. These were added onto our list of consultees. A full list of the consultees is included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>It is unclear how the proposed minimum offset distances of 10m from hedgerows and 15m to locally designated wildlife sites have been identified and derived. The basis and justification for these distances needs to be explained.</p>	<p>The offset distances for the hedgerows are based on British Standard BS:5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Code of Practice. The offset from woodlands is based on Natural England, Ancient woodland, ancient trees</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
Lincolnshire County Council	Under 'Land and soils' it is stated that the proposal will seek to retain fields that comprise majority Grade 1 and 2 within arable production where possible. This should however be extended to include Grade 3a land as this is still classed as 'best and most versatile'.	<p>and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-ancient-trees-and-veteran-trees-advice-for-making-planning-decisions#ancient-woodland">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-ancient-trees-and-veteran-trees-advice-for-making-planning-decisions#ancient-woodland</a>); and British Standard BS:5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Code of Practice. The distance from local wildlife sites is based on professional judgement.</p> <p>Buffer distances have been detailed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and secured within the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has been attempted to reduce the use of higher grade agricultural land, where practicable. Reasonable alternatives considered are provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has sought to minimise impacts on BMV land and preferably use land in areas of poorer quality except where this would be inconsistent with other</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>sustainability considerations. All fields comprising solely of Grade 1 or 2 land within the site will remain in arable production, as detailed in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>. The Applicant notes that Grade 3a land is also classified as BMV land, however, given the large areas of Grade 3a land within the area being considered for the Proposed Development, it would not be a viable scheme on smaller land parcels, or without the use of some BMV land. By using grade 3a land in preference to Grade 1 or Grade 2 land, the Application has attempted to minimise the impact to very high sensitivity soils.</p> <p>Several fields within the Order Limits will be required for installation of cabling, but will be returned to agricultural use after the cable has been laid (<b>ES Volume 2, Figure 3.1: Zonal Masterplan [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>).</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Disagree with the proposal to scope out this as a specific chapter of the ES and to instead be considered as part of a separate assessment. Whilst the Council accepts that each case must be considered on its merits, glint and glare impacts were scoped into the ES for the Heckington Fen Solar Farm (NSIP Ref: EN010123) although the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) agreed that aviation impacts could be excluded. In this case there are three RAF</p>	<p>The Planning Inspectorate has agreed (via the Scoping Opinion) that glint and glare can be scoped out of the assessment. However, a glint and glare assessment has been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment of likely</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>bases in and around the proposed development and so we recommend that PINS seek the advice of those bases in relation to potential glint and glare impacts, not least given that there is the potential for tracking panels to be used. Furthermore, there is the potential for cumulative and in-combination effects with other topics/chapters considered by ES (e.g. landscape and visual impact, impacts on residential amenity assessment) and so this should form part of the ES so that any cumulative and in-combination effects can be assessed together and not form part of a separate assessment that sits outside the ES.</p>	<p>significant effects and is presented in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. Results from the assessment concluded that instances of yellow glare are possible at RAF Cranwell, Hill Top Farm, Temple Bruer Airfield (Griffins Farm Airfield) and Cottage Farm Airfield and instances of green glare considered to have a low impact are possible at RAF Waddington and Old Manor Farm.</p> <p>Mitigation to reduce the glint and glare impacts, in the form of planting is embedded within the design and is presented within <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 3.3: Green Infrastructure Parameters [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Human health - Agree this can be scoped out as a specific chapter in the ES and that considerations will form part of other topics/chapters.</p>	<p>Noted. While human health has been scoped out of the ES, human health impacts in relation to dust and noise have been considered and assessed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration, Chapter 13: Population and Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> with any relevant mitigation measures secured within the</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p><b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> which is submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> outlines potential impacts of glint and glare that could cause nuisance to people living in nearby residential properties.</p> <p>Likely significant effects to human health are not expected as a result of the Proposed Development.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Material Assets and Waste - Agree that this can be scoped out as a specific chapter of the ES on the condition consideration of potential borrow pits is included within the chapter/section under Section 6.6 (Land, soils and groundwater). The location of potential borrow pits will need to be identified and must be included within the proposed Order Limits and an assessment of impacts, including cumulative effects, arising from the working and restoration of identified borrow pits included as part of the ES</p>	<p>No borrow pits are proposed as part of the Proposed Development.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 5.8.1 of the Scoping Report states that the requirement to consider population in UK EIA practice was introduced via the 2017 update to the EIA Regulations, with impacts to population taken to refer to socio-economic impacts. There is no proposed ES chapter heading dealing solely with socio-economic impacts and instead the applicant suggests that a 'Socio-Economic Benefits Statement' will be submitted in support of the DCO Application.</p>	<p>Per the methodology agreed with PINS in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.2: Scoping Opinion [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>, an assessment of population impacts, including socio-economic impacts is presented in a individual chapter within the <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. Therefore a socio-</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	<p>Disagree with the proposal to scope out this as a specific chapter of the ES and to instead be considered as part separate assessments (e.g. Flood Risk Assessment and Construction Environmental Management Plan). There is too much uncertainty at this stage given the site area is significant, possible site layout and potential location of the BESS and NGC as well as drainage requirements, etc. Therefore we consider this should be included as specific chapter in the ES.</p>	<p>economic benefit statement is no longer being submitted as the required detail is included within <b>Chapter 13</b>.</p> <p>Aspects of the water topic have been scoped in for further assessment and detailed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. However, flood risk has been agreed to be scoped out and is assessed as part of the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b> submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application. The drainage design is provided within the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> (which forms an appendix to the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b>). The principles of the proposed drainage strategy were shared with the Lead Local Flood Authority as part of the consultee engagement (via email correspondence), no concerns on the drainage principles were raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p>
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	<p>Note powerlines/cables up to 132kV are not expected to exceed ICNIRP exposure guidelines but there is no mention or reference to the NGC and new Transmission Towers (TT) and associated 400kV cables. RAF Digby is the HQ of the Joint Cyber and Electromagnetic Activities Group and is located immediately west of proposed Springwell Central. Given the potential impacts associated with the NGC, TT and 400kV an assessment is likely to be required however it is recommended that PINS takes into</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
Lincolnshire County Council	<p>account the views of RAF Digby and relevant defence consultees before agreeing whether this topic should be scoped out of the ES.</p> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council agrees this matter should be 'scoped in' and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES.</li> <li>• If borrow pits are proposed then the location of these will need to be confirmed along with any potential impacts associated with the working and restoration of those sites (e.g. dust and traffic emissions) on receptors close to those specific sites.</li> <li>• No specific comments regarding the proposed methodology of scope of the assessment at this stage.</li> <li>• Recommend that comments and advice provided by North Kesteven District Council be taken into account.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> includes an assessment of likely significant effects arising from the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of the Proposed Development upon Air Quality. No borrow pits are proposed as part of the Proposed Development and therefore assessment on the potential impacts associated with the working and restoration of the borrow pits sites on nearby receptors are not included in the ES.</p> <p>Comments and advice from North Kesteven District Council have been taken into account. Further information related to consultation can be found in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	<p><u>Biodiversity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council agrees this matter should be 'scoped in' and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES.</li> <li>• Unclear how embedded mitigation measures identified in Table 4.1 have been identified/derived. For example, it is proposed that a minimum offset</li> </ul>	<p>A biodiversity assessment is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, which includes method of assessment, assessment of impacts on protected sites, habitats and species, and details mitigation measures</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>distance of 10m from hedgerows and 15m to locally designated wildlife sites – how have these been identified?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No specific comments regarding the proposed methodology of scope of the assessment at this stage.</li><li>• Recommend that comments and advice provided by NKDC, Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and Natural England be taken into account.</li></ul>	<p>and embedded design relevant to biodiversity.</p> <p>Comment and advice from North Kesteven District Council, Natural England and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust has been taken into account. For example North Kesteven District Council advised that wintering birds and arable plant surveys should be carried out, which were subsequently undertaken. Advice from Natural England was sought regarding the results of the wintering bird surveys. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust was consulted on the biodiversity design including buffer zones and habitat creation and enhancement proposals near LWS. The buffer zone of at least 10m from field boundaries is considered sufficient to protect the root zones of hedgerow trees and hedgerow shrubs from ground works and protect field margins. The buffer of at least 20m from woodlands is considered sufficient to protect tree root and canopy zones as it follows government standing advice as a buffer zone for protecting ancient woodland. LWS within or adjacent to the Site are mostly grassland road verges. A 15m buffer is considered sufficient distance to avoid impacts to the LWS grassland as pollution prevention</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>measures, such as control of dust deposition, would also be put in place. Other LWS are Blankney Brick Pit LWS and Bloxham LWS which are woodland and would therefore have a 20m buffer. Embedded design will be secured within the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4], Works Plans [EN010149/APP/2.3]</b> and additional mitigation measures detailed in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7],</b> and <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13].</b></p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p><u>Climate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council agrees this matter should be ‘scoped in’ and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES.</li> <li>• This chapter/section should:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- take into account GHG emissions associated with the full life-cycle of the development and potential sources of GHG emissions. This includes emissions associated with the production of the PV panels and other supporting equipment as well as that associated with the transportation, construction and operation of the development, including replacements that may be necessary during the lifetime of the development; and</li> <li>- identify the potential savings in GHG emissions associated with the operation of the development as a result of the consequent reduction in use of more carbon-emitting electricity generation methods; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Further detail is provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. With regards to the request to ‘<i>assess any increase in carbon emissions as a result of the need to transport/import food and crops from elsewhere which would have otherwise been grown on the arable farmland that would be lost or removed from production as a consequence of the development.</i>’, this was not required by the Inspectorate, nor is it practical to quantify in any meaningful manner. The number of assumptions which would be required for</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>- assess any increase in carbon emissions as a result of the need to transport/import food and crops from elsewhere which would have otherwise been grown on the arable farmland that would be lost or removed from production as a consequence of the development. Such an assessment would enable the full carbon gains or benefits of this proposal to be properly understood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council requests that the Inspectorate therefore requires the applicant to include such an assessment within the ES.</li> </ul>	<p>the many variables which would influence such an assessment (e.g., the type of produce that would have been grown for each year of operation, the quantity of produce that would have been grown for each year of operation, the location(s) of which the replacement produce would be sourced, the mode of transport of the replacement produce etc.,) are too great for any assessment to be made.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p><u>Cultural Heritage</u>                      The Council agrees this matter should be 'scoped in' and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES. We would refer PINS and the applicant to the more general comments provided by the Council's Historic Environment Team which are attached to this response – Appendix 1. The following points are however highlighted and we would request that PINS take these into account when issuing its decision and/or the applicant take these into account when preparing the PEIR/ES.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Whilst the applicant has discussed this proposal with the County Historic Environment Team they are also advised to liaise with the Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire who act on behalf of NKDC especially in relation to the scope of and timing of any intrusive evaluation following completion of the geophysical survey.</p>	<p>Lincolnshire County Council Heritage Team, Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire and North Kesteven District Council have been consulted regarding the scope and timing of intrusive evaluation. Details of consultation held to date are included with the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b></p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p><u>Cultural Heritage</u></p>	<p>The ES has been based on a full archaeological desk-based assessment,</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>We expect the desk based evaluation to be complete and the field evaluation to be well underway by the time the PEIR is produced. It's vital that a competent full desk based assessment (DBA) be completed at the earliest opportunity as desk based work provides the basis for initial understanding. This is informed by, and built upon, by a full air photo/LiDAR assessment and geophysical survey which in turn assists in the development of the trial trenching programme. The full suite of archaeological evaluation is required and must be completed in time to inform the mitigation strategy which will lay out how the developmental impact on archaeology will be dealt with. This needs to be submitted as part of the EIA (and not left as a DCO Requirement as suggested in paragraph 6.4.6 – see comments below).</p>	<p>stage 1 setting assessment, aerial investigation and mapping report and geophysical survey. Full details of the assessments and report can be found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Appendix 9.3: Aerial Investigation Report and Appendix 9.4: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. These non-intrusive evaluation methods informed the scope of intrusive evaluation (trial trenching) to inform the ES and the <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> to inform the detailed design and mitigation strategy. It is considered appropriate for further trenching to be secured as a Development Consent Order Requirement as has been done for other solar farms (e.g. Mallard Pass).</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.4.2 of the Scoping Report references LCC's "General guidance on large schemes including NSIPs, EIAs...etc" and it is proposed that a study area of 2km from the site boundary be used for assessing non-designated assets and 5km, informed by the ZTV, for assessing designated assets. Given the uncertainty regarding extent and footprint of the site area, possible site layout and positioning of various elements at this stage, the proposal has the potential for both direct physical impacts</p>	<p>The Stage 1 Setting Assessment presented Appendix 9.1 – Annex 12 within the <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> has used a study area of 2km from the Site for</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>on heritage assets as a result of construction and also on the setting of heritage assets due to the extent of possible visual change. It is therefore recommended that the study areas for both designated and non-designated assets be the same at 5km.</p>	<p>non-designated assets and 5km from the Site for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance. Assets identified in the stage 1 setting assessment as being sensitive to changes in their setting have been filtered for detailed assessment based on a worst case ZTV for the proposed development. Updated HER searches have been carried out for revisions to the order limits and the Archaeological Desk-based Assessment has been updated. Details on the ZTV can be found <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.4.3 of the Scoping Report – data sources need to also include reference to Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan which contains schedules and descriptions of heritage assets within the Plan area</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan has informed the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment presented in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.4.6 of the Scoping Report – indicates that additional mitigation to off-set adverse impacts will take the form of a programme of archaeological investigation and recording secured by a DCO Requirement. As indicated above, the Council cannot agree to this approach and recommends that PINS makes clear that the full suite of archaeological evaluation presubmission/determination. We are aware that on-site geophysical survey work is anticipated to be completed by the end of April 2023 and until the results of those surveys are known the Council cannot agree to a programme of archaeological investigation being</p>	<p>The ES has been based on a full archaeological desk-based assessment, stage 1 setting assessment, aerial investigation and mapping report and geophysical survey. Full details of the assessments and report can be found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>deferred to a post decision DCO Requirement. It is highly likely that trial trenching will be required not only across known or suspected archaeology but also across the 'blank' areas to obtain baseline evidence where previous evaluation techniques have not identified archaeological remains</p>	<p><b>Assessment, Appendix 9.3: Aerial Investigation Report and Appendix 9.4: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b> These non-intrusive evaluation methods informed the scope of intrusive evaluation (trial trenching) to inform the ES and the <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> to inform the detailed design and mitigation strategy. It is considered appropriate for further trenching to be secured as a Development Consent Order Requirement as has been done for other solar farms (e.g. Mallard Pass).</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.4.7 of the Scoping Report – the significance of each asset must be assessed prior to scoping which assets would be affected. Modelling should particularly include any identified assets which have the potential to be visible or have their setting affected by the taller elements of the development</p>	<p>The Stage 1 Setting Assessment presented Appendix 9.1 – Annex 12 within the <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> has used a study area of 2km from the Site for non-designated assets and 5km from the Site for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance. Assets identified in the stage 1 setting assessment as being sensitive to changes in their setting (based on their particular characteristics) have been filtered for</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
Lincolnshire County Council	Paragraph 6.4.8 of the Scoping Report – receptors to be ‘scoped in’ need to also include reference to Conservation Areas at Scopwick, Blankney and Bloxholm.	<p>detailed assessment based on a worst case ZTV for the proposed development. Details on the ZTV can be found in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>These conservation areas have been considered in the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	Paragraph 6.4.9 of the Scoping Report – proposes to scope out setting impacts on listed dwellings within settlements over 1km from the site. There is no assessment contained in the Scoping Report to support this and to justify why and how the 1km reference has been derived. The reference just to ‘dwellings’ rather than ‘buildings’ is also unclear and so needs to be clarified as to does the decision to single out K6 kiosks for consideration.	<p>The term "dwellings" refers specifically to residential buildings, meaning homes where people live, rather than all types of buildings. For clarity, the ES distinguishes between residential and non-residential buildings throughout the assessment to ensure impacts are appropriately evaluated for each type.</p> <p>Assets beyond 1km from the Site are not anticipated to experience significant effects based on an appraisal of how their setting contributes to their significance and the ZTV which shows limited visibility at this range.</p> <p>The Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment found in <b>ES Volume 3,</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
Lincolnshire County Council	Paragraph 6.4.11 of the Scoping Report – the assessment of heritage assets and impacts within the landscape needs to begin from an understanding of the significance of each heritage asset in order to assess the potential impact of the development upon them and put forward any	<p><b>Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> has used a study area of 2km from the Site for non-designated assets and 5km from the Site for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance. Assets identified in the stage 1 setting assessment as being sensitive to changes in their setting based on their particular characteristics have been filtered for detailed assessment based on a worst case ZTV for the proposed development. Details on the ZTV can be found in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>PINS agreed on Listed K6 telephone kiosks to be scoped out on the grounds that their surroundings make a neutral contribution to their significance as they are found in a variety of contexts throughout the UK. The Inspectorate agrees that significant effects on such assets are unlikely to arise.</p> <p>The Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting</b></p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>potential benefit or mitigation of proposed negative impact. It is not just potential visual impact with views to, from and across any other heritage asset which may be affected and how it can be viewed from any point which is publicly accessible, it's also how the heritage asset is experienced kinetically and within its landscape. Assessment of all this must start with an understanding of the significance of each heritage asset and any interrelationships it may have with other heritage assets as well as the landscape in which it sits, for example remnant field boundaries of the field system that surrounded and supported a Medieval village.</p>	<p><b>Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> has used a study area of 2km from the Site for non-designated assets and 5km from the Site for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance. Assets identified in the stage 1 setting assessment as being sensitive to changes in their setting based on their particular characteristics have been filtered for detailed assessment based on a worst case ZTV for the proposed development. Details on the ZTV can be found in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Assessments of significance should be undertaken for all designated and undesignated assets which may be affected to ensure any assets subject to proposed descoping has an evidence base.</p>	<p>The Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> has used a study area of 2km from the Site for non-designated assets and 5km from the Site for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance. Assets identified in the stage 1 setting assessment as being sensitive to changes in their setting based on their particular characteristics have been filtered for detailed assessment based on a worst case ZTV for the proposed development</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>The assets included for detailed assessment are include an assessment of significance within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Landscape and Visual - The Council agrees this matter should be 'scoped in' and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES.</p>	<p>An assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Landscape and Visual - We would refer PINS and the applicant to the jointly-procured detailed feedback provided by AAH on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council and NKDC contained in Appendix 2 of this response – 'Technical Memorandum 1: AAH TM01' and request that PINS incorporate this advice into their final opinion. The following points are however highlighted and we would request that PINS take these into account when issuing its decision and/or the applicant take these into account when preparing the PEIR/ES.</p>	<p>Noted. See responses to individual comments below.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>We would also expect the production of the Landscape and Visual chapter of the ES which would be in the form of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), and any supporting information (such as plans or figures) which reflect current best practice and guidance from, as a minimum, the following sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment', (GLVIA3), April 2013 by the Landscape Institute (LI) and Institute of Environmental</li> </ul>	<p>An assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>All relevant guidance documents are referenced as appropriate in this chapter.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>Management and Assessment (IEMA); - 'An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment', Natural England (2014);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 'Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals', 17th September 2019 by the Landscape Institute (LI);</li> <li>- 'Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 1/20 Reviewing Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (LVIAs) and Landscape and Visual Appraisals (LVAs)', 10th January 2020 by the Landscape Institute (LI).</li> <li>- 'Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 04/20 Infrastructure', April 2020 by the Landscape Institute (LI); and</li> <li>- 'Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 2/21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations', May 2021 by the Landscape Institute (LI).</li> </ul>	<p>TGN 1/20 provides advice to determining authorities and stakeholders on reviewing LVIAs and as such is not a guidance document which concerns the production of LVIA work. This document is therefore not referenced in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>At this initial stage, the content and level of information provided within Section 6.5 is generally considered satisfactory, however, we would expect to discuss this content and approach as part of the iterative process. Due to the scale and extent of the site and proposed development, we would be able to discuss and agree the Scoping questions within Section 6.5.14 as part of this ongoing process, as at this stage it is not possible to provide full answers to these questions.</p>	<p>Since Scoping, the applicant has engaged in further consultation with Lincolnshire County Council and its appointed landscape adviser – AAH Consultants. Details of further discussions regarding landscape and visual matters are set out in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Viewpoints &amp; Photomontages – the final locations of viewpoints are to be reviewed and agreed with LCC and other relevant stakeholders. The final viewpoint selection should also consider views of taller and more conspicuous elements, such as battery storage or sub-stations once the layout is more developed, as well as consider potential key, or sensitive, viewpoints. We would welcome an initial discussion and subsequent workshop (on site if appropriate) with the developer's team in regards to proposed viewpoints. Photomontages/Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) should be produced and the number, location and level/type of the</p>	<p>There has been extensive liaison with AAH Consultants (on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council) in relation to the viewpoint and photomontage locations. Confirmation of agreement to the final selection was provided by AAH Consultants on behalf of North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council on 11 July 2024. Details of the further consultation and</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>these should be agreed with LCC and other relevant stakeholders. At this stage, it is deemed appropriate that these should be produced to illustrate the proposals at different phases: Existing Situation (baseline), Operational (year 1) and Residual with planting established (10 to 15 years).</p>	<p>viewpoint selection are set out in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>The methodology should clearly lay out the process of assessing temporary and permanent elements of the scheme, and the LVIA should clearly identify those elements that would not be decommissioned at the end of the life of the development. This is of particular importance in relation to the NGC which it is assumed will be a permanent feature.</p>	<p>The National Grid Navenby Substation no longer forms part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is to be operational for a period of 40 years per phase. Following the operational (including maintenance) phase, the Proposed Development will require decommissioning. This would involve the removal of all of the Solar PV infrastructure, including the Ground Mounted Solar PV Generating Stations, Collector Compounds, Springwell Substation, BESS and ancillary infrastructure, including any on-site compounds. All concrete, hardstanding areas, foundations for the infrastructure and any internal tracks will be removed to a depth of up to 1m. All the below-ground cables will be left in situ.</p> <p>Decommissioning would include removing any permissive paths and the land will be returned to the landowner. Landscape</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>structural planting, including tree planting, hedgerows, scrub, etc., created to deliver biodiversity mitigation and enhancement associated with the Proposed Development would be left in situ when the Site is handed back to landowners, except for the planting within Tb2, which will be removed to facilitate the releveling and removal of the earth bund to allow the field to be returned to agricultural use. Otherwise, it is assumed that the landowner would return the land to agricultural use when it is handed back.</p> <p>Further detail is included within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Study Area – at this early stage, the proposed study area extents should be discussed and further reviewed as the full extent of potential visibility of the development is not yet fully known, and the ZTV mapping contained within Appendix F of the Scoping Report does identify potential visibility beyond these extents. The ZTV mapping would need to be updated once the proposals have developed (as stated within paragraph 13.5) and the study area should not be fixed until the full extents of visibility are known from both desktop and site work. It therefore seems appropriate to assume a (minimum – TBA) 5km study area across the scheme rather than a reduction to 3km for the solar array or collector compounds/distributed BESS.</p>	<p>The study area has been discussed with Lincolnshire County Council/North Kesteven District Council through further consultation and responding on their behalf on 15th August 2023 AAH Consultants confirmed that 'The proposed 3km study area is appropriate from the solar PV development and 5km from the Springwell Substation. A detailed justification for the LVIA study area and engagement that has been undertaken is presented in <b>ES</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	Sections 6.5.8. and 6.5.9 identify a range of potential landscape receptors to be scoped in or out of the LVIA, however at this early stage of the project we request these be reviewed and consulted upon further once proposals have been developed and we are not in a position to confirm their inclusion or omission. We therefore request that PINS makes it clear in its response that these matters have yet to be agreed.	<p><b>Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1].</b></p> <p>Updated ZTVs can be found in <b>ES Volume 2, Appendix 10.5a-d: Solar PV Standard ZTVs, Appendix 10.6a-d: Solar PV Detailed Screening ZTVs, Appendix 10.7a-c Siting Zone for Satellite Collector Compound ZTVs, Appendix 10.8 Siting Zone for BESS ZTV and Appendix 10.9 Siting Zone for Springwell Substation ZTV [EN010149/APP/6.2].</b></p> <p>Further consultation have been done to agree on the scope of the LVIA. The principal consultees in relation to landscape and visual matters have been North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council. The district and county councils jointly appointed an external landscape consultant (AAH Consultants) to act on their behalf in relation to landscape and visual matters. Therefore, consultation with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council has taken place primarily through AAH Consultants</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>The scope of the LVIA and the receptors/matters scoped in and out of the assessment is discussed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Visualisations regarding to the viewpoints have been agreed with AAH Consultants can be found in <b>ES Volume 4 [EN010149/APP/6.4]</b> and discussion of the change at each viewpoint can be found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.4. [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	Cumulative Landscape and Visual effects should be assessed in regards to other major developments, and in particular commercial scale solar developments, as appropriate in regards to proximity and scale (also see comments under Section 7).	A detailed assessment of the potential cumulative landscape and visual effects is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	At this stage it is not relevant to comment on any potential mitigation or layout of the development. Best practice guidance, relevant published landscape character assessment's and Local and County Council Policy and Guidance should be referred to and implemented as appropriate.	Noted. Best practice guidance, baseline documents and relevant policy is set out in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	Land, Soil and Groundwater - The Council agrees this matter should be 'scoped in' and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES.	Land, Soil and Groundwater matters are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	The ES and ALC assessment should clearly identify how much of the site comprises of agricultural land and identify its ALC grade and current use. The ES should identify what (if any) measures would be taken to retain the	Land, Soil and Groundwater matters are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater</b>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>agricultural land in productive use (i.e. sheep grazing, hay/silage production) and how this would be secured. The ES should also give consideration to the economic effects of the loss or change to the use of the agricultural land as well as a consideration of the potential carbon footprint created through the displacement or removal of this land from productive use. This needs to be properly calculated to ensure that the full carbon gains or benefits of this proposal are accurate.</p>	<p><b>[EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and ALC matters are addressed within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.1: ALC Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. The assessment of Agricultural Land Classification data concluded that 42.3% of the land within the Order Limits is classified as BMV agricultural land. Construction activities are not expected to impact the soil resource enough to cause a reclassification to a lower agricultural land grade.</p> <p>A socio-economic assessment has been produced and included within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> which provides consideration to the economic effects of the change of land use.</p> <p>The area proposed for the cable routes will be temporarily used for the purposes of construction and thereafter during operation will be retained as agricultural land. There is also the potential to use the open spaces between the infrastructure and the land beneath the Solar PV modules for pastoral farming (sheep grazing) during the operation (including maintenance) phase.</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>The soil will be managed during the operational phase by the implementation of measures set out in the <b>Outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b> to minimise impacts to the soil. The <b>oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b> provides details of those areas within the Site which have greater resilience and specifies measures such as timing of the works, to limit the impacts to the soil. The <b>oSMP [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b> also details measures for soil management and instructions for applying the principles of best practice to maintain the physical properties of the soil, with the aim of restoring the land to its pre-construction condition at the end of the lifetime of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>It should also be noted that as part of the Development Consent Order there are legal requirements to ensure the Site is returned to agricultural land after decommissioning. An <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> is submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	<p>Paragraph 6.6.8 of the Scoping Report suggests scoping in the operational impacts of the proposed development in terms of the loss of agricultural and BMV as a consequence of the removal of this land from productive use. The Council agrees with the inclusion of this however the assessment should also include and detail mitigation measures to remove, reduce or minimise such impacts. For example, the possibility of retaining some areas of land in productive use which also act as buffers and stand-offs; enabling some continuance of agricultural activity through sheep grazing or alternative forms of cropping among panelled areas, etc. As part of the ES the applicant should identify a mechanism by which any changes in agricultural activity and associated socio-economic effect can be secured through the DCO process and provide evidence of this (e.g. use of planning conditions, legal agreements, covenants, etc).</p>	<p>The potential impacts of the proposed development during the operational phase in terms of loss of agricultural land and BMV land is scoped into the Environmental Impact Assessment . <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> provides details of the methodology for this assessment, in line with industry guidance. The <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> for the project will provide details of the procedures to protect impacts on soil resources.</p> <p>The project design has minimised use of ALC grade 1 and grade 2 agricultural land, which will be retained for arable production in line with the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>.</p> <p>There is the potential to use the open spaces between the infrastructure and the land beneath the Solar PV modules for pastoral farming (sheep grazing) during the operation (including maintenance) phase, and therefore some agricultural use of the Site can occur during the lifespan of the Proposed Development. It should be noted that although conditions suitable for grazing can be maintained, the Applicant</p>

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

will not be responsible for making arrangements for grazing.

As detailed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]**, the temporary land-take at the Site during the operational phase would result in 0.3% of agricultural land in Lincolnshire being taken out of agricultural use. Indicatively, based on County-wide average employment per ha this would result in the reduction of the indicative capacity for around 30 FTE jobs (total agricultural employment in Lincolnshire is estimated at approximately 8,653 FTE jobs). Engagement with the agricultural operators has confirmed that during the operational period the employment supported by the agricultural activities within the Site would have been moved to another of the operator's agricultural sites nearby, resulting in no net loss of employment (albeit temporary loss of agricultural land). The land within the Order Limits that will be temporarily used during the construction phase to install the cabling will continue to be used for farming operations during the operational (including maintenance) phase.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	The 'alternatives' exercise needs to consider alternative site layouts and potentially a reduction in MW generating capacity in order to demonstrate avoidance or minimisation of agricultural land impacts (as recommended by the Draft NPS EN-3 March 2023).	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered</b> [EN010149/APP/6.1] sets out the Applicant's approach to alternatives, including locations and technologies. 4 alternative locations were identified that met the Applicant's initial site search criteria (as set out in Section 3 of the Site Selection Report at <b>Appendix 1</b> to the <b>Planning Statement [EN01049/APP/7.2]</b>. However, Blankney Estate land performed strongly against the Applicant's search criteria and discussions with the estate advanced sufficiently for the Applicant to have confidence that the project objectives could be delivered and, once agreement with the landowner was in place, the Applicant received its grid connection offer. It is worthy of note that the Applicant is required to justify its choice of site and the robustness of the site selection process and decision making but not required to "<i>establish whether the proposed project represents the best option from a policy perspective</i>" (para. 4.3.9 of NPS EN-1).</p> <p>The Site Selection Report, Appendix 1 of the <b>Planning Statement [EN01049/APP/7.2]</b> explains the process which has resulted in the Site being</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>selected including which criteria were used in site selection and how the site selection process performs against the key requirements of NPS EN-3. Please also see the response to the Alternative Site Analysis section, above.</p> <p>On the matter of land type, the report also concludes that there was no available land of a lower agricultural or non-agricultural grade available which would meet the project objectives. NPS EN-3 sets a preference for the use of non-agricultural or lower grade agricultural land but accepts that the use of some agricultural land is likely, that the development of solar PV on Grade 1 and 2 land is not prohibited and that land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location (see para. 2.10.29 of NPE EN-3).</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Reference is given to the proximity of Mineral Consultation and Mineral Safeguarding Areas within the current Minerals &amp; Waste Local Plan. It is stated that as the majority of the land take would be temporary, future extraction would be possible after decommissioning. This would not apply in respect of the proposed NGC and so this needs to be taken into account.</p>	<p>The National Grid Navenby Substation no longer forms part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>On the basis the Proposed Development has a lifespan of up to 40 years per phase and due to the Proposed Development being decommissioned at the end of its operational life, any minerals would not be</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	A Minerals Assessment will be required as part of the application. The findings of this assessment could inform and influence the design and layout of the development and potentially remove areas of land that lie close to existing quarries or which could potentially be worked in the future.	<p>permanently sterilised and would be available to exploit if required at a future date. The minerals within the Order Limits will not be permanently sterilised, and post-decommissioning, the land could be worked for minerals. The Proposed Development is reservable by nature, and therefore there is not considered to be any conflict with the M11 mineral safeguarding policy.</p> <p>A Mineral Safeguarding Assessment is part of the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b> submitted with the Development Consent Order Application.</p> <p>A Mineral Safeguarding Assessment is part of the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b> submitted with the Development Consent Order Application.</p> <p>The Proposed Development will be decommissioned after 40 years per phase, and any impacts caused by the Proposed Development related to land use are considered reversible and temporary. The minerals within the Order Limits will not be permanently sterilised, and post-decommissioning, the land could be worked for minerals.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	Unless considered elsewhere within the ES, this chapter will need to also consider potential borrow pits that may be used as part of the development. The ES should confirm if borrow pits are proposed and identify the location of these which must be included within the proposed Order Limits. The ES will also need to contain an assessment of impacts, including cumulative effects, arising from the working and restoration of identified borrow pits and these included as part of the ES.	No borrow pits are proposed as part of the Proposed Development.
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	Noise and Vibration - The Council agrees this matter should be 'scoped in' and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES.	Noise and Vibration matters are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	Noise and Vibration - No specific comments regarding the proposed methodology of scope of the assessment at this stage.	Noted.
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	Noise and Vibration - Recommend that comments and advice provided by NKDC.	Noted. North Kesteven District Council has been consulted. Further information related to consultation can be found in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	Traffic and Transport - The Council agrees this matter should be 'scoped in' and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES.	Traffic and Transport matters are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and secured by <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> , <b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.8]</b> , <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Path Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> .

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	<p>The Council is generally agreeable to the methodology and approach detailed within the Scoping Report but recommends that discussions with the Highway Authority continues in order to ensure that the scope of the assessments is agreed. A Transport Assessment for the construction period will be required and safety and capacity impacts will need to be assessed to ensure that the impact on the highway network is acceptable. The primary point of operational access is assumed to be directly from or via the A15 Sleaford Road and onto the B1191. Access points and locations will therefore also need to be identified and discussed with Highways.</p>	<p>Further consultation with Local Highway Authority have been undertaken.</p> <p>Traffic and Transport matters including information related to consultation and assessment are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and secured by <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3], Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.8], Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10].</b></p> <p>The Transport Assessment includes an assessment of the construction period including safety and capacity impacts.</p> <p>Phase Two Consultation included indicative zones for the location construction access points as agreed with Local Highway Authority. Following consultation, these zones have been reduced in size or removed to increase the distance from homes and businesses while taking into account the need for safe access and egress to the Order Limits.</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>This chapter of the ES should also consider potential cumulative construction effects (and where relevant operational effects) associated with other large-scale and NSIP scale projects including Triton Knoll, Viking Link, Heckington Fen Solar park (including works to Bicker Fen Substation), Beacon Fen Energy Park, Temple Oaks Renewable Energy Park and the Lincolnshire Reservoir depending on the timeframes of those projects. The assessment should also considered TCPA projects including the Sleaford West and potentially the Sleaford South SUEs (A17/A15 corridor), along with the Lincoln South East Quadrant (SEQ) SUE which sits alongside parts of the A15 and B1188.</p>	<p>The Applicant has engaged with NKDC on the short list of developments that have been assessed within the cumulative assessment, presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Energy infrastructure developments including TCPA solar developments have been considered within the ZOI and have been included within the short-list if they meet the criteria outlined in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>An assessment of the inter-project cumulative effects with the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Traffic and Transport matters are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and secured by <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	A Travel Plan would be required for a project of this scale to ensure that the significant numbers of construction workers are encouraged to use alternative modes to the private car.	<p><b>[EN010149/APP/6.3], Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.8], Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Path Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10].</b></p> <p>An outline Travel Plan is appended to the <b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.8]</b> in support of the Development Consent Order. This sets out strategies to encourage the use of sustainable transport for the construction workforce.</p>
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	There is an extensive network of public rights of way (PRoW) within the site which link with the surrounding settlements. Opportunities to create new and expanded routes that would improve access and links between settlements should be considered with potential additional public footpaths and bridleways created as part of the development. Any such routes should not utilise routes used for construction or maintenance activities and be a minimum width of 4m for public footpaths and 5m for public bridleways. Any fencing alongside a public path should be open mesh construction and not close board timber fencing or metal palisade to avoid the creation of narrow claustrophobic. Any new routes to be created should look to be formally adopted as part of the Definitive Rights of Way network rather than permissive routes which could potentially be removed at any point during the life of the project. If permissive routes are proposed then details of what mechanisms would be adopted to ensure these remain in place for the duration and life of the development is needed.	<p>The Applicant is proposing to enhance approximately 2km of existing PRoW and provide approximately 3.7km of additional PRoW and 8.6km of permissive paths to improve connectivity within the area and around the Order Limits. Additional and enhancements of these networks encourage their use for recreational purposes ensuring the networks are safer and connect settlements.</p> <p>No Public Rights of Way will be permanently closed or diverted as a result of the Proposed Development. Principally, crossing points will be established to maintain access to routes for all users, whilst considering user and worker safety</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>for the duration of the construction phase. This will minimise the need for temporary closures during construction. The <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b> details requirements during the construction phase available at this stage and as discussed with the Local Highway Authority Public Rights of Way Officers.</p> <p>Proposals for new permissive footpaths following feedback from the first stage of consultation are detailed within the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b>, alongside <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and associated <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Cumulative Effects - The Council agrees this matter should be 'scoped in' and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES.</p>	<p>Cumulative Effects are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>The Council disagrees that NSIP projects must lie within the ZoI of the development which is based on the study area for each environmental factor considered in the EIA. The County is currently subject of several other NSIP projects and these all need to be taken into account in terms of</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> sets out the Cumulative effects, methodology for</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>potential cumulative effects in particular in respect of LVIA and impacts on 'best and most versatile' agricultural land. Of particular relevance are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- West Burton Solar Project</li> <li>- Cottam Solar Project</li> <li>- Gate Burton Energy Park</li> <li>- Heckington Fen Solar Park</li> <li>- Mallard Pass Solar Park</li> <li>- Temple Oaks Renewable Energy Park – Tillbridge Solar Project</li> <li>- Beacon Fen Energy Park</li> <li>- Lincolnshire Reservoir</li> </ul> <p>We are aware that there may well be further NSIP projects coming forward in the not to distant future and therefore we reserve the right to highlight other projects as and when these become known and can advise how these might be treated with reference to Table 2 of Advice Note Seventeen 'Cumulative effects assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects'.</p>	<p>carrying out the assessing and Zone of Influence for each environmental factor.</p> <p>Consultation with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council detailed in <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b> has been undertaken to agree on the final short list for inclusion in the ES.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Finally, in addition to the above comments, the Council has also been sent and received a copy of comments and views on the proposed Scoping Report prepared by a local Parish Council. Attached to this response is a copy of that response/comments which we have been asked be brought to the attention of the Inspectorate. The Council recognises that local residents and communities have the benefit of local knowledge and so is supportive of their involvement and comments at this stage and invites the Inspectorate to therefore take these comments into account and, where considered necessary, require appropriate assessments or information to be provided as part of the ES by stating this explicitly within its formal response.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to Local Parish feedback within this matrix.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Lincolnshire County Council Historic Environment</b>		
<b>LCC Historic Environment</b>	<p>It's vital that a competent full desk based assessment (DBA) be completed at the earliest opportunity as desk based work provides the basis for initial understanding. This is informed by and built upon by a full air photo/LiDAR assessment and geophysical survey which in turn assists in the development of the trial trenching programme. The full suite of archaeological evaluation is required. The evaluation work must be completed in time to inform the mitigation strategy which will lay out how the developmental impact on archaeology will be dealt with, therefore this will need to be submitted as part of the EIA.</p>	<p>The ES has been informed by a Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Aerial Investigation and Mapping and geophysical survey. Full details of the assessments and report can be found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Appendix 9.3 Aerial Investigation Report and Appendix 9.4: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. The scope and timing of further evaluation has been discussed and agreed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council. Further information related to consultation can be found in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<b>LCC Historic Environment</b>	<p>Section 6.4.1 of the scoping report states that "Further consultation with Lincolnshire County Council will be carried out to confirm the scope of and timing of any intrusive evaluation following completion of the geophysical survey." Trial trenching is required not only across known or suspected archaeology but also across the 'blank' areas to obtain baseline evidence where previous evaluation techniques have not identified archaeological remains. Trenching results are essential to get a full understanding of the archaeology which will be impacted across the full impact zone and will</p>	<p>The ES has been based on a full archaeological desk-based assessment, stage 1 setting assessment, aerial investigation and mapping report and geophysical survey. Full details of the assessments and report can be found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>inform an archaeological mitigation strategy which is reasonable, appropriate and fit for purpose.</p>	<p><b>Assessment, Appendix 9.3 Aerial Investigation Report and Appendix 9.5: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b> These non-intrusive evaluation methods informed the scope of intrusive evaluation (trial trenching) to inform the ES and <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> to inform the detailed design and mitigation strategy. It is considered appropriate for further trenching to be secured as a Development Consent Order Requirement as has been done for other solar farms (e.g. Mallard Pass).</p>
<p><b>LCC Historic Environment</b></p>	<p>Trial trenching is part of the standard range of archaeological evaluation and full trenching results are essential for effective risk management and to inform programme scheduling and budget management. Failing to do so could lead to unnecessary destruction of heritage assets, potential programme delays and excessive cost increases that could otherwise be avoided. A programme of trial trenching is required to inform a robust mitigation strategy which will need to be agreed by the time the Environmental Statement is produced and submitted with the DCO Application</p>	<p>Programme of trial trenching has been undertaken and the results are detailed within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.5: Trial Trenching Report [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b></p>
<p><b>LCC Historic Environment</b></p>	<p>Regarding the Study Area (section 6.4.2) and the EIA Baseline Information (sections 6.4.3 and 6.4.4), these are required for the main site boundary and any proposed connection route options. Until they are descoped all</p>	<p>The National Grid Navenby Substation is no longer form part of the Proposed Development. The grid connection route</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>connector route options need to be properly assessed as part of the development and as part of the ES.</p>	<p>options to this substation have been included in the <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Appendix 9.3 Aerial Investigation Report and Appendix 9.5: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> and have been assessed within the <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9 Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>LCC Historic Environment</b></p>	<p>Section 6.4.4 of the Scoping Report ends with the following statement: The Scoping Report states “The need for, scope, and timing of intrusive evaluation will be negotiated and agreed with the statutory consultees following completion of the desk-based assessments and geophysical survey.” As stated above, a sufficient trenching programme across the impact zone is essential in understanding the character, depth and extent of surviving archaeology which would be impacted by the development.</p>	<p>Statutory consultees have been consulted to agree on the scope of the assessment. Information related to consultation can be found in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9 Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The ES has been based on a full archaeological desk-based assessment, stage 1 setting assessment, aerial investigation and mapping report and geophysical survey. Full details of the assessments and report can be found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Appendix 9.3 Aerial Investigation Report and Appendix 9.4 Geophysical Survey Report</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>LCC Historic Environment</b>	<p>Section 6.4.6 of the Scoping Report is entitled 'Additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation', what is the primary mitigation?</p> <p>The proposed mitigation options of Section 6.4.6 includes preservation in situ, excavation and 'watching brief'. Archaeological topsoil strip, map and record is also an essential part of the suite of archaeological mitigation techniques, and all of these will need to be informed by sufficient evaluation including trenching to determine where archaeologically sensitive areas are and their full extent to inform a competent reasonable mitigation strategy.</p>	<p><b>[EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. These non-intrusive evaluation methods informed the scope of intrusive evaluation (trial trenching) reported in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.5 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> which is considered to be proportional to the likely impacts of the Proposed Development. The non-intrusive and intrusive evaluation has informed the ES and <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> to inform the detailed design and mitigation strategy. It is considered appropriate for further trenching to be secured as a Development Consent Order Requirement as has been done for other solar farms (e.g. Mallard Pass).</p> <p>Primary mitigation comprises embedded mitigation through the design and layout of the Proposed Development. Embedded mitigation measures will be secured within the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>. Following consultation with Lincolnshire County and North Kesteven District Council detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and the <b>Consultation Report</b></p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>[EN010149/APP/5.1], the scope and timing has informed the mitigation strategy.</p> <p>A Desk-based assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>), Aerial Investigation and Mapping (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.3 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>), Geoarchaeological Deposit Modelling (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.2 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>), Geophysical Surveys (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.4 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>) and targeted Trial Trenching (<b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.6 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>) have informed the baseline for the ES.</p> <p>These evaluation methods have identified areas of archaeological interest including possible settlement which have been considered in the ES. An <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> has been prepared setting out the proposed strategy for further evaluation at detailed design stage and mitigation measures for known heritage assets.</p> <p>A programme of further archaeological investigation as set out in the <b>Outline</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p><b>Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> will inform the detailed design of the Proposed Development to be secured through a DCO Requirement. This will include trenching of the cable routes and other areas where excavation is proposed (such as for ITS and new access roads). Other mitigation for known heritage assets is set out in the ES and <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> and includes excavation of the area for the Collector Compound in Field By22 to mitigate any impacts on the WWII crash sites. As detailed in the outline Written Scheme of Investigation <b>[EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> mitigation measures for any archaeological remains identified during the additional trial trenching will be agreed with the local authority archaeological advisor and Historic England as appropriate.</p>
<p><b>LCC Historic Environment</b></p>	<p>Regarding section 6.4.7 of the Scoping Report description of likely significant effects, please be advised that the significance of each asset must be assessed prior to scoping which assets would be affected. Modelling should particularly include any identified assets which have the potential to be visible or have their setting affected by the taller elements of the development.</p>	<p>The Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> has</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>LCC Historic Environment</b>	<p>Regarding section 6.4.11 of the Scoping Report Proposed assessment methodology, the assessment of heritage assets and impacts within the landscape needs to begin from an understanding of the significance of each heritage asset in order to assess the potential impact of the development upon them and put forward any potential benefit or mitigation of proposed negative impact.</p> <p>It is not just potential visual impact with views to, from and across any other heritage asset which may be affected and how it can be viewed from any point which is publicly accessible, it's also how the heritage asset is experienced kinetically and within its landscape. Assessment of all this must start with an understanding of the significance of each heritage asset</p>	<p>used a study area of 2km from the Site for non-designated assets and 5km from the Site for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance. Assets identified in the stage 1 setting assessment as being sensitive to changes in their setting based on their particular characteristics have been filtered for detailed assessment based on a worst case ZTV for the proposed development found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. The assets included for detailed assessment are include an assessment of significance within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> has used a study area of 2km from the Site for non-designated assets and 5km from the Site for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>and any interrelationships it may have with other heritage assets as well as the landscape in which it sits, for example remnant field boundaries of the field system that surrounded and supported a Medieval village.                      Assessments of significance should be undertaken for all designated and undesignated assets which may be affected to ensure any assets subject to proposed descopeing has an evidence base</p>	<p>Assets identified in the stage 1 setting assessment as being sensitive to changes in their setting based on their particular characteristics have been filtered for detailed assessment based on a worst case ZTV for the proposed development found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.                      The assets included for detailed assessment are include an assessment of significance within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The development has been designed to minimize the impacts on the experience of moving between the settlements, this is discussed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>LCC Historic Environment</b></p>	<p>The EIA will require the full suite of comprehensive desk-based research, non-intrusive surveys, and intrusive field evaluation for the full extent of proposed impact. The results should be used to minimise the impact on the historic environment through informing the project design and an appropriate programme of archaeological mitigation. The provision of sufficient baseline information to identify and assess the impact on known and potential heritage assets is required by Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Regulation 5 (2d)),</p>	<p>The ES has been based on a Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Aerial Investigation and Mapping, Geophysical Survey and targeted trial trenching. Full details of the baseline, assessments and reports can be found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>National Planning Statement Policy EN1 (Section 5.8), and the National Planning Policy Framework. Sufficient information on the archaeological potential must include evidential information on the depth, extent and significance of the archaeological deposits which will be impacted by the development. The results will inform a fit for purpose mitigation strategy which will identify what measures are to be taken to minimise or adequately record the impact of the proposal on archaeological remains which must be submitted with the EIA.</p> <p>This is in accordance with The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 which states “The EIA must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner...the direct and indirect significant impacts of the proposed development on...material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape.” (Regulation 5 (2d)).</p>	<p><b>Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Appendix 9.3 Aerial Investigation Report, Appendix 9.4: Geophysical Survey Report and Appendix 9.6: Trial Trenching Report [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b></p> <p>These results have informed the masterplan and design principles to minimize impacts on heritage assets. An <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> to inform the detailed design and mitigation measures for residual effects on archaeological remains has been submitted with the Development Consent Order and is secured as a Development Consent Order Requirement.</p> <p>Mitigation measures to reduce impacts to archaeology are detailed and secured within the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7].</b></p>

**North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council**

<p><b>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Overall, we would expect that the assessment of potential Landscape and Visual matters and evolving proposals relating to the Springwell Solar Farm, as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), follow an iterative process of engagement and consultation to ensure the following</p>	<p>Following a series of meetings with AAH Consultants a list of matters has been discussed. Details of the outcome of the meetings to date is summarised in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and</b></p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>are not fixed at this stage and are discussed, developed and agreed at subsequent technical meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Methodology;</li> <li>• Development, and subsequent ZTV, parameters;</li> <li>• Study Area extents (distance);</li> <li>• Viewpoint quantity and locations;</li> <li>• Photomontage/Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quantity and location;</li> <li>- Phase depiction;</li> <li>- AVR Type and Level.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Mitigation Measures/Landscape Scheme/Site Layout;</li> <li>• Cumulative effects, including surrounding developments to be considered; and</li> <li>• The extent as to which a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) should be considered (based on the Landscape Institute TGN 2/19) if there are residential properties with receptors likely to experience significant effects to their visual amenity</li> </ul>	<p><b>Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]. The Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b> contains full details on the agreed number, location and type of visualisation alongside mitigation measures discussed.</p> <p>Visualisations regarding to the viewpoints have been agreed with AAH Consultants can be found in <b>ES Volume 4 [EN010149/APP/6.4]</b> and discussion of the change at each viewpoint can be found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.4. [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b></p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>We would also expect the production of the Landscape and Visual chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES), which would be in the form of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), and any supporting information (such as plans or figures) reflect current best practice and guidance from, as a minimum, the following sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment’, (GLVIA3), April 2013 by the Landscape Institute (LI) and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA);</li> <li>• ‘An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment’, Natural England (2014);</li> </ul>	<p>All relevant guidance documents are referenced as appropriate in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. TGN 1/20 provides advice to determining authorities and stakeholders on reviewing LVIA's and as such is not a guidance document which concerns the production of LVIA work. This document is therefore not referenced in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals’, 17th September 2019 by the Landscape Institute (LI);</li> <li>• ‘Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 1/20 Reviewing Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (LVIAs) and Landscape and Visual Appraisals (LVAs)’, 10th January 2020 by the Landscape Institute (LI);</li> <li>• ‘Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 04/20 Infrastructure’, April 2020 by the Landscape Institute (LI); and Landscape Technical Memo 1 April 2023 Lincolnshire County Council, Springwell Solar Farm</li> <li>• ‘Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 2/21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations’, May 2021 by the Landscape Institute (LI).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>While the focus of this review is on Landscape and Visual matters, other information provided within the report, and associated Appendices, has also been considered, providing background and context to the site. At this initial stage of the NSIP process, the content and level of information provided by the developer within Section 6.5 Landscape and visual are generally considered satisfactory, however, as stated previously, we would expect to discuss this content and approach as part of the iterative process. Due to the scale and extent of the site and proposed development, we would be able to discuss and agree the Scoping questions within Section 6.5.14 as part of this ongoing process, as at this stage it is not possible to provide full answers to these questions. The following should be considered in the evolving assessment and layout:</p>	<p>Since Scoping, the applicant has engaged in further consultation with AAH Consultants. Details of further discussions regarding landscape and visual matters are set out in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. See responses to individual comments below. Full detail of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>The final locations of viewpoints are to be reviewed and agreed with LCC and other relevant stakeholders. The final viewpoint selection should also consider views of taller and more conspicuous elements, such as battery storage or sub-stations once the layout is more developed, as well as consider potential key, or sensitive, viewpoints. We would welcome an</p>	<p>Further consultation on the viewpoints has been undertaken with AAH Consultants resulting in a letter dated 15th August 2023 confirming that the viewpoint selection was ‘proportional to the project and extent of potential visual receptors.’ Full detail of</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	initial discussion and subsequent workshop (on site if appropriate) with the developer's team in regards to proposed viewpoints.	consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b> .
<b>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</b>	To gain an understanding of the visibility of the development and how the panels and infrastructure would appear in the surrounding landscape, Photomontages/Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) should be produced. The number and location of the agreed viewpoints to be developed as Photomontages/AVRs should be agreed with LCC and other relevant stakeholders and produced in accordance with TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals. At this stage, it is deemed appropriate that these should be produced to illustrate the proposals at different phases: Existing Situation (baseline), Operational (year 1) and Residual with planting established (10 to 15 years). The Photomontage/AVR Level and Type is to be discussed and agreed.	As per the comment above, representative assessment viewpoints have been agreed with AAH Consultants and visualisations (e.g. photomontages) will be presented for a selection of these in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .  The number, location and type of visualisation for each viewpoint have been agreed through consultation with AAH Consultants before submission of the ES. Details of further discussions regarding landscape and visual matters are set out in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> . Visualisations have been prepared in accordance with the stated guidance and illustrate effects in Year 1 and Year 10. Full detail of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b> .
<b>North Kesteven District Council and</b>	As stated previously, the LVIA should be carried out in accordance with the GLVIA3 and undertaken by suitably qualified personnel. The methodology provided at Section 6.5.11 and Appendix D is typical of those used for ES Chapters and standalone LVIA where potential significant effects can be	The LVIA will be undertaken by Chartered Landscape Architects and in accordance with the most up to date published best practice guidance as set out in <b>ES Volume</b>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	<p>considered and reflects the guidance in GLVIA3. We would request that the most up to date technical guidance be used and the methodology is further interrogated at the next phases of the project.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual methodology within Appendix D identifies that Significant effects are identified as those that are “Major or Major/Moderate”, and that in the case of predicting Moderate effects professional judgement will be applied. This is fine and follows GLVIA3, however for full transparency, we would expect that a full explanation be provided in the assessment as to whether a Moderate effect on a receptor is assessed as being Significant or not, and not simply relying on stating that an effect is not significant “based on professional judgement”.</p> <p>The methodology should also clearly lay out the process of assessing temporary and permanent elements of the scheme, and the LVIA should clearly identify those elements that would not be decommissioned at the end of the life of the development, such as the National Grid substation, and assessed accordingly.</p>	<p><b>1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1].</b></p> <p>The ES provides full justification for each judgement including for any conclusions of ‘Moderate’ significance.</p> <p>A detailed methodology for the LVIA is provided in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.1: Landscape and Visual Methodology and Assessment Criteria [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. The ES clearly identifies those elements of the Proposed Development which would not be decommissioned at the end of the operational period.</p>
<b>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</b>	<p>It is acknowledged in Section 6.5.2 of the Scoping Report that, based on desktop (ZTV mapping) and field study, an initial Study Area covering 3km has been allowed for the proposed development, and an extended Study Area covering 5km for the National Grid substation and National Grid connecting tower. At this early stage, we recommend these extents are discussed and further reviewed as the full extent of potential visibility of the development is not yet fully known, and the ZTV mapping within Appendix F does identify potential visibility beyond these extents. The ZTV mapping would be updated once the proposals have developed (as stated within paragraph 13.5) and the study area should not be fixed until the full extents of visibility are known from both desktop and site work. Once the study area has been defined, the LVIA should also provide a justification for the</p>	<p>The study area has been discussed through further consultation and on 15th August 2023 AAH Consultants confirmed that ‘The proposed 3km study area is appropriate from the solar PV development and 5km from the Springwell Substation. Justification has been provided for the study areas and have confirmed no significant views are available from beyond the study area. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>full extent/distance, which would be further refined as part of the iterative process.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the National Grid Substation and connecting towers no longer form part of the Proposed Development. The ZTVs demonstrate that in the worst-case scenario there would be negligible visibility of the Proposed Development beyond the study area proposed above. Any landscape or visual effects beyond this distance would not be significant. Prior to the completion of <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, the final fixed layout was reviewed.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Published landscape character areas have been identified, however to align with GLVIA3 the LVIA should include an assessment of landscape effects at a range of scales and likely need to include a finer grain landscape assessment that includes the Site and immediate area that also considers individual landscape elements or features that make up the character area. Sections 6.5.8 and 6.5.9 of the Scoping Report identify a range of potential landscape receptors to be scoped in or out of the LVIA, however at this early stage of the project we request these be reviewed and consulted upon further once proposals have been developed and we are not in a position to confirm their inclusion or omission.</p>	<p>Further analysis of landscape character is provided <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, including Appendices 10.2 and 10.3. The scope of the LVIA and the receptors/matters to be scoped in and out of the assessment are reviewed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Further consultation have been done to agree on the scope of the LVIA. The principal consultees in relation to landscape and visual matters have been</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Several visual receptors are identified within Sections 6.5.5 and 6.5.8 of the Scoping Report. We would expect that the visual assessment would include for identification of visual receptors, and not just an assessment of any agreed viewpoints, which should clearly cross reference viewpoints to associated receptors. Sections 6.5.8 and 6.5.9 of the Scoping Report identify a range of potential visual receptors to be scoped in or out of the LVIA, however at this early stage of the project we request these be reviewed and consulted upon further once proposals have been developed and we are not in a position to confirm their inclusion or omission. The visual assessment should take account of the 'worst case scenario' in terms of winter views, and effects associated with landscape mitigation at the Operational Phase (year 1), Residual Phase with planting having established (10 to 15 years), and at the Decommissioning Phase. The</p>	<p>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council. The district and county councils jointly appointed an external landscape consultant (AAH Consultants) to act on their behalf in relation to landscape and visual matters. Therefore, consultation with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council has taken place primarily through AAH Consultants.</p> <p>The scope of the LVIA and the receptors/matters scoped in and out of the assessment is discussed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>It is confirmed that the visual assessment will focus on assessing effects on visual receptors rather than viewpoints. Representative viewpoints are provided to illustrate the nature and scale of effect at various locations but are a tool to assist in the assessment of effects.</p> <p>Further consultation have been done to agree on the scope of the LVIA. The principal consultees in relation to landscape and visual matters have been North Kesteven District Council and</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>LVIA should ensure all elements associated with the development are considered and assessed, such as battery storage, sub-stations, CCTV poles and boundary fencing, which may be more visible than panels due to height, mass and extent</p>	<p>Lincolnshire County Council. The district and county councils jointly appointed an external landscape consultant (AAH Consultants) to act on their behalf in relation to landscape and visual matters. Therefore, consultation with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council has taken place primarily through AAH Consultants</p> <p>The scope of the LVIA and the receptors/matters to be scoped in and out of the assessment are reviewed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Visualisations regarding to the viewpoints have been agreed with AAH Consultants can be found in <b>ES Volume 4 [EN010149/APP/6.4]</b> and discussion of the change at each viewpoint can be found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.4. [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>The assessment takes account of seasonal variations in visibility and operational phase effects will be assessed in Year 1 and Year 10. Construction and Decommissioning effects are considered</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>Cumulative Landscape and Visual effects should be assessed in regards to other major developments, and in particular commercial scale solar developments, as appropriate in regards to proximity and scale.</p>	<p>as well. The LVIA takes into account all new infrastructure.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>As this is an iterative process, at this stage it is not relevant to comment on any potential mitigation or layout of the development. However, best practice guidance, relevant published landscape character assessment's and Local and County Council Policy and Guidance shall be referred to and implemented as appropriate.</p> <p>We would also expect the landscape and planting scheme is coordinated with other relevant disciplines, such as ecology, heritage or civils (e.g. SuDS features), to improve the value of the landscape and reflect appropriate local and regional aims and objectives. Any Landscape Scheme and associated Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan should accompany the ES which should cover the establishment period, which is assumed would be up to 15 years to cover the period up to the residual assessment. The management plan should provide for both new planting and existing retained vegetation and how it will be managed and protected through all phases of the development</p>	<p>The approach to cumulative effects is set out in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and visual effects will be assessed in detail in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</b></p>	<p>As this is an iterative process, at this stage it is not relevant to comment on any potential mitigation or layout of the development. However, best practice guidance, relevant published landscape character assessment's and Local and County Council Policy and Guidance shall be referred to and implemented as appropriate.</p> <p>We would also expect the landscape and planting scheme is coordinated with other relevant disciplines, such as ecology, heritage or civils (e.g. SuDS features), to improve the value of the landscape and reflect appropriate local and regional aims and objectives. Any Landscape Scheme and associated Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan should accompany the ES which should cover the establishment period, which is assumed would be up to 15 years to cover the period up to the residual assessment. The management plan should provide for both new planting and existing retained vegetation and how it will be managed and protected through all phases of the development</p>	<p>Best practice guidance, baseline documents and relevant policy is set out in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. A landscape scheme and <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> has been submitted with the ES. The <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> covers the establishment period as well as the long-term management of the site and existing as well as new vegetation.</p> <p>The landscape and planting scheme has been developed in coordination with other relevant disciplines, including ecology, heritage, and civil engineering, to ensure a cohesive approach that enhances the landscape's value and supports local and regional objectives.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
---------------------	----------	----------------------

Habitat creation proposals are shown in **ES Volume 2, Figure 3.3: Green Infrastructure Parameters Plans [EN010149/APP/6.2]** and detailed in the **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]**.

**Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council**

**Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council**

1. Is there an impact pathway from the Proposed Development to the aspect/matter?
  2. Is the aspect/matter sensitive to the impact concerned?
  3. Is the impact likely to be on a scale that may result in significant effects to the aspect/matter?
  4. Could the impact contribute cumulatively with other impacts to result in significant effects to the aspect/ matter?
  5. Is there a method of avoidance or mitigation that would reduce the impact on the aspect/matter to a level where significant effects would not occur?
  6. Is there sufficient confidence in the avoidance or mitigation method in terms of deliverability and efficacy to support the request?
  7. Is there empirical evidence available to support the request?
  8. Do relevant statutory consultees agree with the request?
  9. Have you had regard to (a) relevant National Policy Statement(s) (NPS) and specifically any requirement stated in the NPS(s) in respect of the assessment of this aspect/matter?
- The subsequent comments and observations will demonstrate that factors proposed to be scoped out of the EIA are not justified as they fail to follow the above Guidelines.

The ES has been based on the EIA Scoping Opinion that was received from the Planning Inspectorate as detailed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.2 [EN010149/APP/6.3]**. Where the EIA differs from the Scoping opinion, this is outlined in the ES chapter, presented in **ES Volume 1 [EN010149/APP/6.1]**.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	Temporary diversions potentially lasting two years will substantially impact the community's freedom of the community to walk the local countryside with adverse consequences to their health and well being	<p>Assessment of pedestrian amenity is undertaken within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, complemented by a <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b> for construction phase works. It is the aim of the Applicant to maintain access to all PRow routes where possible, with any diversions required to be temporary in nature (6 month closures).</p> <p>Regarding impacts during construction, these are expected to be minimal, and managed in the first instance by banksperson allowing all users to access PRow safely and may include secure fencing and signage for all users</p> <p>Management of PRow and permissive paths will be undertaken in accordance with the measures set out in the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b>.</p>
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	It is not clear whether all the current footpaths and permitted paths are covered in the text since the facility to walk within the development site extends to more than just the PROWs found there. This entire facility is enjoyed and valued not only by the parish but also by the surrounding	Assessment of pedestrian amenity is undertaken within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> , complemented by a

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>wider community in the District. A reduction to any of these will impact all communities' freedom of the community to walk the local countryside with adverse consequences to their health and well being.                      Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged.</p>	<p><b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b> for construction phase works. It is the aim of the Applicant to maintain access to all PRow routes where possible, with any diversions required to be temporary in nature (6 month closures). There would be no permanent closures of PRow as part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Regarding impacts during construction, these are expected to be minimal, and managed in the first instance by banksperson allowing all users to access PRow safely and may include secure fencing and signage for all users</p> <p>Management of these links is detailed in the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Observation. The above observation fundamentally challenge the Report's assertion that "human health is not subject to dedicated assessment and therefore excluded from the scope of the EIA.", since in each proposed example quite the opposite appears to be true.                      Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged.</p>	<p>The Planning Inspectorate has agreed that human health can be scoped out of the assessment, on the basis that the ES should clearly set out potential impacts to human health from the Proposed Development during construction, operation and decommissioning and cross-</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>reference where impacts are considered and assessed within other relevant chapters of <b>ES Volume 1 [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, with any relevant mitigation measures secured within the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> which is submitted in support of the DCO Application.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration, Chapter 13: Population and Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> have considered the potential effects related to human health within their own assessment.</p> <p>Furthermore, <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> considers the potential human health effects from glint and glare.</p> <p>Likely significant effects to human health are not expected as a result of the Proposed Development.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Observation. Within the development's Site boundary work associated with the development is being planned to take place on land allocated for housing in the made Neighbourhood Plan.                      Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged</p>	<p>Noted. This has been taken into consideration in the design.</p> <p>This is not considered within the ES, however further detail on the land allocations and compliance with the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan are detailed within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Observation. The changes to the local environment arising from the proposed development will very inevitably impact the value of public and private residential property and housing in the area contributing cumulatively to other social/economic impacts. This is a factor that should not be excluded from the EIA assessment                      Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged.</p>	<p>Published research and evidence to date in consideration of property values and large-scale solar development has not provided any conclusive evidence.</p> <p>The Applicant has developed the design of the Proposed Development to incorporate appropriate offsets to local settlements. The Applicant's approach to designing the Proposed Development is set out in the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>This has formed part of the iterative design and Environmental Impact Assessment process and is assessed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Volume 3,</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p><b>Appendix 10.5: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b></p> <p>As a result of the offsets that have been incorporated into the Proposed Development, the landscape and visual assessment confirms that the development would not impact the character of local settlements (Scopwick, Blankney, Kirkby Green, RAF Digby and Ashby de la Launde) and would not be visible from any locations within them except for potentially glimpsed views from RAF Digby. Whilst a small number of residential properties would have some view of the Proposed Development, the design approach and mitigation measures proposed ensure the visual effects would not be overbearing at any dwelling</p> <p>An assessment of impacts to public and private residential properties has not been assessed within the ES, in accordance with comments received from PINS presented in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.2: Scoping Opinion [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	<p>Observation. The community benefits from its current environment as a rural agricultural area which the proposed development as a mega-sized industrial plant will fundamentally impact. Therefore this should not be scoped out of the EIA assessment</p> <p>Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged</p>	<p>Agricultural land has been scoped into the assessment. An assessment of Agricultural Land Classification data has been undertaken and is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>, which demonstrates compliance with applicable planning policy. The assessments concluded that 42.3% of the land within the Order Limits is classified as BMV agricultural land. Construction activities are not expected to impact the soil resource enough to cause a reclassification to a lower agricultural land grade.</p> <p>An assessment of the cumulative loss of BMV land as a result of solar developments in the area is addressed within <b>ES Volume, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. An assessment of agricultural land holdings and associated jobs in the agriculture sector is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Observation. The development will impact on the numbers employed on land held by the landlord and as well have a significant effect on employment by the many peripheral trades and businesses associated with agriculture in that area during the operational phase and beyond it. While at present there are no other businesses, land allocated for business use, or planning applications for such within the Site, there nevertheless is the possibility that such, say as small cooperative agricultural holdings or business enterprises being generated any time in future as an alternative to the proposed development. Therefore these should not be scoped out of the EIA assessment Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged</p>	<p>Agricultural land holdings and agricultural economy has been scoped into the assessment.</p> <p>An assessment of impacts to agricultural land holdings and employment is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. There are two agricultural operations within the study area, these operations will be moved to nearby agricultural land and therefore there will be no net job losses or impact to agricultural businesses. 0.3% of the agricultural land in Lincolnshire will be taken out of agricultural production as a result of the Proposed Development. The chapter concludes that there will be no significant impacts to agricultural land holdings and the agricultural economy as a result of the Proposed Development.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Observation. As with 5.63 and 64 it is not clear whether all the current footpaths and permitted paths are covered in the text. This facility is enjoyed and valued not only by the parish but also by the surrounding wider community in the District. A reduction to any of these will impact all communities' freedom of the community to walk the local countryside with adverse consequences to their health and well being.                      Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged</p>	<p>Pedestrian amenity has been scoped into the assessment.</p> <p>The traffic and transport assessment in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> has considered the impacts on Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths within the Order Limits. The assessment has been complemented by a <b>Outline Public Rights</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p><b>of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b> for construction phase works. It is the aim of the Applicant to maintain access to all PRow routes where possible, with any diversions required to be temporary in nature (up to 6 months).</p> <p>Impacts during construction are expected to be minimal, and managed in the first instance by banksperson allowing all users to access PRow safely and may include secure fencing and signage for all users</p> <p>Management of these links is detailed in the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Observation. The suggested increase in benefits can at best only be in the short term. Meanwhile as stated above the value added to the local economy resulting from the development will be negative as will occupancy rates in hospitality venues. This inevitably has significant effect on the population.</p> <p>Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged</p>	<p>Employment and occupancy has been scoped into the assessment and is presented within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Proposed Development will support temporary job creation during the construction phase. Results from the assessment concludes that there will be beneficial and not significant impacts to employment during the construction phase.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>The assessment acknowledges that there may be potential adverse impacts on employment within the agricultural sector. However, it is intended that agricultural operations may continue during the operation of the Proposed Development. Engagement with the agricultural operators confirmed that during the operational phase, agricultural activities will be moved to nearby sites resulting in no net loss of employment. The land that will be used during the construction phase to install cabling will continue to be used for farming operations during the operational phase. Therefore, there will be no significant effects to local agricultural jobs.</p> <p>Regarding impacts to occupancy rates, results from the assessment concluded that it is expected no significant effects on occupancy rates of local accommodation providers during the construction or operational phase and therefore impacts on hospitality and tourist businesses are not expected.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Observation. As the effects on population have been demonstrated as significant factors to the EIA as affecting the local and regional area it is justified that it should also be included in the EIA Report'FINAL VERSION OBS ON SPRINGWELL SOLAR FARM SCOPING REPORT Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged</p>	<p>Population has been scoped into the assessment and is presented within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. Receptors/matters scoped into the assessment includes employment and gross value added; agricultural land holdings and agricultural economy; occupancy rates as a result of an influx of workforce staff to the area; tourism, walkers, cyclists and horse riders via impacts to Public Rights of Way; and education, skills and supply chain.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>The preceding observations demonstrate that the proposal to scope out from the EIA environmental factors of significance without suitable justification will invalidate its very purpose and is therefore to be challenged. These factors should be made to be part of this EIA process.</p>	<p>Justification for scoping out factors from the ES is provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Approach to EIA [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR</b></p>		
<p><b>NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR</b></p>	<p>In order to maintain flexibility in the design, it is the Applicant's intention to use the 'Rochdale Envelope' approach within parameter ranges. The Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine 'Rochdale Envelope' [Ref 2-1] provides specific guidance to applicants on the degree of flexibility that could be considered appropriate under the PA2008 regime. The Rochdale Envelope approach was developed to assist with the development of much large national infrastructure projects such as HS2 where at the start it is difficult to know what matters will be relevant as the project develops. This flexible approach is not appropriate for a development of this limited and static nature where the matters to be considered can be determined at the start. Its use in this context would be</p>	<p>The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. The Rochdale Envelope approach is an established and accepted method under the Planning Act 2008, which allows for flexibility in project parameters to adapt to potential advancements in technology at the time of construction. This approach is relevant to the Proposed Development as it enables a comprehensive assessment of the likely significant effects while accommodating</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>an abuse of the process allowing the Applicants to change their plans at will without proper scrutiny.</p>	<p>future technological developments within controlled, predefined limits.</p> <p>The level of flexibility assessed is detailed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: Location of the Proposed Development</b> and <b>Chapter 5: Approach to EIA [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. Establishing maximum parameters in key areas—such as height, massing, and noise levels—ensures that the Environmental Statement (ES) can rigorously assess a realistic worst-case scenario. These assessment parameters form the basis for evaluating potential impacts and are outlined in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and presented in full in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 3.1: Project Parameters [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>The spatial extent of each Work Number, which provides the framework for the assessment, is illustrated on the <b>Works Plans [EN010149/APP/2.3]</b>. For specific assessments, any assumptions and parameters are described in the relevant technical chapters (<b>ES Volume 1, Chapters 6 to 15 [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>). This approach ensures a robust and</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR</b>	<p>The Proposed Development will include landscaping, habitat management, biodiversity enhancement, and amenity improvements, which will be explored as the design progresses. This will be sensitivity designed to retain and enhance ecological and recreational connectivity. Where possible, existing trees, hedgerows, public rights of way and Local Wildlife Sites would be retained.</p> <p>Comment Received: The words 'explored' and 'recreational connectivity' are not specific enough again the information in the ES needs to be more specific.</p>	<p>thorough environmental assessment that meets regulatory requirements while maintaining flexibility for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Noted. We understand the need for greater specificity in describing the commitments related to recreational connectivity within the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The Proposed Development includes well-defined landscaping and habitat measures, specifically designed to improve ecological networks and recreational access across the site. This includes the retention and enhancement of public rights of way to maintain accessible routes for the community, alongside the preservation and reinforcement of existing natural features, such as trees, hedgerows, and Local Wildlife Sites, where possible.</p> <p>The <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> covers the establishment period of the embedded mitigation which includes a landscaping scheme and a programme of construction reinstatement of habitat creation.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR</b>	<p>The National Grid Substation compound, Project Substation compound, BESS compounds, and Collector Compounds would include lighting, in accordance with relevant standards, but will not be permanently lit.                      Comment Received: Just lit after dark? Needs to be specific.</p>	<p>The National Grid Navenby Substation no longer forms part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The lighting of the Springwell Substation and within Work No.4 and Work No. 5, would be in accordance with health and safety requirements, particularly around any emergency exits where there would be lighting, similar to street lighting that operates from dusk. Otherwise, lighting sensors will be implemented around the Springwell Substation and Work No. 3, Work No. 4 and Work No. 5, for security purposes and a sensitive lighting scheme will be developed to ensure inward and downward distribution of light, avoiding light spill onto existing boundary features.</p>
<b>NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR</b>	<p>The use of borrow pits during construction of the Proposed Development will be considered as the design develops. The potential benefit of including borrow pits as part of the Proposed Development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows extracted aggregate to be transported to construction locations (largely via site access tracks) within the Site.</li> <li>• Generates significantly lower levels of Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements on the local highway network than importation of aggregate from commercial quarries.</li> <li>• Reduces cost risks arising from double handling, importation from commercial quarries and landfill disposal.</li> </ul>	<p>No borrow pits are proposed as part of the Proposed Development.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>The benefit of using borrow pits will be carefully considered against any potential environmental impacts. Further detail on the approach to identifying suitable borrow pit locations and justification for their inclusions as part of the Proposed Development will be provided as part of the PEIR and ES.</p> <p>Comment Received: This is a cost cutting exercise allowing the Developers to quarry their own aggregate out of the heath sub-soils to use to build temporary roads and hardstandings; further details and approval from the Environment Agency should be gained. The land where borrow pits are excavated will never be returned to proper agricultural use and this procedure should be prohibited as unnecessary and open to abuse. Unnecessary as there is a limestone quarry adjacent to the proposed site. Open to abuse as there is no monitoring of the 'rubbish' that may end up being dumped in a pit rather than properly (and more expensively) disposed of</p>	
<p><b>NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR</b></p>	<p>A programme of construction reinstatement and habitat creation will commence during the construction phase.</p> <p>The above statement is a contradiction in terms, the construction machinery and the work being carried out will be disruptive and will have an adverse effect on wildlife, surely 'during' should be 'after' and further specific detail is required.</p>	<p>The <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> provides a detailed framework for managing and mitigating environmental impacts during both the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development. While construction activities can be disruptive, specific mitigation measures are implemented from the start to reduce adverse effects on local habitats and wildlife.</p> <p>Where feasible, construction activities are carefully scheduled and phased to allow</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>habitat creation and establishment in areas unaffected by ongoing work. This early-stage habitat creation, along with wildlife corridors integrated into the design, helps support biodiversity throughout construction. Additionally, protective measures, such as buffer zones and controlled working areas, are established to limit the impact on sensitive habitats and species.</p> <p>The impacts on habitats and wildlife are discussed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR</b></p>	<p>An Outline Soils Management Plan (oSMP) will be prepared and submitted with the DCO Application. The oSMP will follow the principles of best practice to maintain the physical properties of the soil, with the aim of restoring the land to its pre-construction condition at the end of the lifetime of the solar farm.</p> <p>With regard to agricultural land remediation. The document states the land will return to agricultural use at the end of the 40 year period, will the ES confirm that if the development is approved all of the concrete bases, foundations, piles and all other sub-structure elements are grubbed up, crushed and recycled on site into aggregate and then removed for future construction use, also where necessary replacing any topsoils with a similar heathland soil where required? If this land is not properly restored it will not be able to be farmed in a conventional manner, unable to be cultivated or harvested due to the potential damage to farm machinery. Wild grasses and weeds will grow and it will look something like the old</p>	<p>During the decommissioning phase, it is assumed that all concrete, hardstanding areas, foundations for the infrastructure and any internal tracks will be removed to a depth of up to 1m. It is assumed that all the below ground cables will be left in situ.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is anticipated to generate some Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) through operation and maintenance, and a substantive amount of WEEE at decommissioning which would include Solar PV modules, batteries, and substation equipment, as well as other</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>Butlins Filey holiday camp site does today. I like to see wildflowers growing but not 4,200 acres of them, when this best and most versatile land should be growing food crops</p>	<p>smaller quantities of WEEE from supporting electrical infrastructure. As such, these would be recovered and recycled by an authorised re-processor as required by the WEEE Regulations 2013. To ensure that this is done to “Best Available Treatment Recovery and Recycling Techniques”, a list of up-to-date authorised re-processors would be established prior to the operational phase of the Proposed Development and kept up to-date throughout the operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. This is secured through the <b>Outline Operation Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> and the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> which are submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.</p> <p>Following decommissioning the land will be returned to the landowner for agricultural use in line with the measures detailed in the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> and <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b>. It is assumed that the landowner would</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR</b>	<p>Above ground infrastructure decommissioning and DEMP. The ES should properly address this? At the moment solar panels at the end of their usable life are finding their way into landfill in Africa. As far as we know there is no recycling facility in the UK. The West's relationship going forward with China is uncertain. Springwell should fully address these matters at this pre-planning stage. The Lincoln Heath is a very fragile part of our county. The heathland soils are light in nature with an element of limestone particles within the growing medium, very free draining to the limestone brash subsoils which continue down to the water bearing strata which is the Central Lincolnshire aquifer which provides drinking water to many hundreds of thousands homes.</p>	<p>return the land to agricultural use when it is handed back.</p> <p>The landscape management plan has been developed with the Estate to ensure that the landscape design and long-term habitats align with the Estate long term strategy. Details on the landscape management plan are within the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is anticipated to generate some Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) through operation and maintenance, and a substantive amount of WEEE at decommissioning which would include Solar PV modules, batteries, and substation equipment, as well as other smaller quantities of WEEE from supporting electrical infrastructure. As such, these would be recovered and recycled by an authorised re-processor as required by the WEEE Regulations 2013. To ensure that this is done to “Best Available Treatment Recovery and Recycling Techniques”, a list of up-to-date authorised re-processors would be established prior to the operational phase</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR</b>	<p>The villages of Scopwick and Kirkby Green have been adversely effected by flooding particularly during periods of high rainfall with an increasing incidence in recent years. The problems created by old and poorly maintained surface water drainage and sewerage systems may be exacerbated by the hard landscaping and the solar panels themselves. This should be investigated at an early stage in assessing the suitability of the land for solar panels.</p>	<p>of the Proposed Development and kept up to-date throughout the operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. This is secured through the <b>Outline Operation Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> and the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> which are submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.</p> <p>The ES provides a thorough assessment of potential impacts on water, soil and groundwater which are detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater</b> and <b>Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>To address flood risk, an Outline Drainage Strategy has been prepared and is included as an appendix to the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> (which forms an appendix to the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b>). This strategy confirms that the Proposed Development will not increase surface water runoff rates. Measures to manage drainage have been carefully designed to ensure that local</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR</b>	The natural aquifer which is a unique feature of the Lincolnshire Heath and feeds the many springs and streams which occur along the site of the proposed solar development should be assessed and protected. The risks of pollution need to be assessed and monitored. In particular those associated with known risks of harmful chemicals from solar panels and battery installations.	<p>flood risk will not worsen, particularly for nearby areas such as Scopwick and Kirkby Green, where historical drainage issues are noted.</p> <p>The design includes sustainable drainage measures to prevent additional strain on existing drainage systems and ensure that no increase in offsite flood risk occurs due to the solar panels or associated infrastructure. Further details on the flood risk and drainage management approach can be found in the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b>.</p> <p>The potential of water pollution have been considered in detail as part of the assessments undertaken and it is concluded can be mitigated effectively. Mitigation measures specific to management of water quality have been detailed further in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> as part of the additional mitigation. An <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> will be provided to manage water quality during construction, examples include providing silt fencing.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>Groundwater contamination has been assessed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment has concluded that in areas of the Site where the groundwater sensitivity is medium or low, the magnitude of impact from leaks and spills of fuel or chemicals during construction works would be considered to be low with the implementation of additional mitigation measures. Therefore impacts on groundwater are considered to be no significant during construction.</p> <p>In areas of the Site where there is a principal aquifer in conjunction with a groundwater SPZ (zone 1, 2 or 3), the receptor sensitivity is high. With the implementation of additional mitigation measures, the potential for leaks and spills will be minimised, and in the event of spillage events, the impacts would be localised and limited in duration. This results in the magnitude of impact being categorised as low. Therefore impacts on groundwater are considered to be no significant during construction.</p> <p>The <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>includes methods for handling, storing, and using any fuels or chemicals to ensure that any spills are contained quickly and effectively, thereby protecting the aquifer and local water bodies. In areas where groundwater sensitivity is medium or low, impacts from accidental leaks or spills are expected to be minimal, with a low adverse effect. In areas of high groundwater sensitivity, such as principal aquifers, additional mitigation will further reduce the risk, leading to a low adverse effect, which is not considered significant.</p>
<p><b>NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR</b></p>	<p>The area is home to many protected species well adapted to the current landscape of open farmland and small woodlands. A full protected species survey should be carried out before construction begins and the habitats protected from development. The area is home to the wild brown hare whose numbers have declined rapidly in recent years due to habitat loss. They are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and listed as a priority species under the UK post 2010 Biodiversity Framework. The area is also an important habitat for birds of prey including the red kite, buzzard and barn owl. The number of barn owls is declining and this native bird was placed on the Red List of Birds of Conservation Concern (2021). Similarly the area has important populations of ground nesting birds namely skylarks and lapwings, both species named on the Red List as numbers have been subject to recent dramatic decline. Other animals reported in the area and protected by law include bats, hazel dormice, slow-worms and badgers. The area is also home to several populations of deer, whose populations range over fields threatened with being fenced off</p>	<p>The design principles are to avoid habitats of high ecological value and enhance/ or create habitats where possible to mitigate habitat loss and provide benefit to priority and notable species.</p> <p>The surveys carried out are considered sufficient to provide baseline information on the importance of habitats and species on site to enable an informed assessment of impact. Further targeted surveys were carried out once design details were updated to inform the design and mitigation in order to avoid significant adverse impact.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR</b>	<p>and covered with solar panels. At a time when the UK has been assessed as one of the most ecologically impoverished countries in the world, it is proposed to take large areas of open countryside and valuable wildlife habitat for industrial use.</p> <p>Of those living and working in the area should be considered particularly the effects on mental health. The pandemic highlighted the importance of being out in nature for our mental health. The considerable disruption of construction over many months together with the industrialisation of the landscape with high metal fencing, closely packed solar panels, lighting, CCTV and 3.5m high solar stations housing transformers on this vast scale will necessarily have a negative impact on mental health in an area which is used for both residential and recreational purposes.</p>	<p>Consideration of potential human health impacts of the Proposed Development are covered through the findings of other assessments undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment process, such as air quality, landscape and visual, noise and vibration and traffic and transport.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration, Chapter 13: Population and Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport</b></p> <p><b>[EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> have considered the potential effects from the Proposed Development during construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning, including effects on mental health.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> has considered the potential impacts to health as a result of the change in the visual environment during the construction and</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>		
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	<p>RSK are not an independent body. They have a biased towards these projects as their ultimate parent company invest in these projects. We should be pushing for a truly independent body. This should be clearly highlighted as a major concern by the PC. RSK are own by a major US private Equity firm called Ares who are directly involved in the Green Energy Market.</p>	<p>the operational phases. Where possible; plants, hedges and trees will be retained or more will be planted in order to provide a visual barrier close to residential properties and Public Rights of Way (PRoW). construction and operation.</p> <p>RSK is not owned by Ares. RSK is a privately held, employee-owned business.</p> <p>RSK is held to the same high standards of professionalism as all Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) consultants, including through its registration with the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) EIA Quality Mark. The scheme includes independent review of RSKs EIA work as well as its delivery against seven 'EIA commitments'.</p> <p>The ES identifies a range of possible impacts of the Proposed Development, including both beneficial and adverse, together with mitigation measures to maximise beneficial effects and prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset adverse effects.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>This seems to be a common strategy by solar factory developers. Similar strategy was deployed by Mallard Pass developers. We should strongly object. The following should not be taken out of scope - 5.2 (Glint &amp; Glare), 5.3 (Heat &amp; Radiation), 5.4 (Major accidents and disaster), 5.5 (Utilities), 5.6 (Human health), 5.7 (Material assets and waste), 5.8 (population) and 5.9 (Water)</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), including environmental factors to be scoped in/out, has been determined by the EIA Scoping Opinion received from PINS. <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.3: Scoping Opinion Response Matrix [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> presents the responses received via the Scoping Opinion and the Applicant's responses to each matter raised.</p> <p>The EIA Regulations require the Environmental Statement to be based on the scoping opinion. In instances where the assessment has not been based on the scoping opinion, this has been agreed with the relevant statutory consultee and is detailed along with the associated justification within the <b>Section 4: Approach to the assessment of ES Volume 1, Chapters 6 – 15 [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate has agreed (via the Scoping Opinion) that the following environmental factors/other environmental considerations can be scoped out of the assessment: glint and glare; heat and radiation; major accidents and disasters;</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>utilities, human health, material assets and waste; and electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields. Justification for this agreement, and the approach taken, is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Whilst the Planning Inspectorate has agreed that these environmental factors can be scoped out of the assessment as part of the EIA of likely significant effects, the following assessments have been undertaken for completeness: <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>; <b>BESS Plume Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.19]</b>; and <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 5.1: Desk-based Study of Existing Utilities [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>LA 112 is not relevant they need to reconsider - LA112 is for transport projects this isn't a transport project (Design Manual for Roads &amp; Bridges) There are major impacts to all the groups above as highlighted by the 95% who voted against this project in the last Parish meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.8.5- 5.8.7 Private Property &amp; Houses</li> <li>- They see no impact on our properties</li> <li>• 5.8.8-5.8.9 Community Land &amp; Assets</li> <li>- They want this out of scope, they miss the point we live in this area for the outstanding natural beauty.</li> </ul>	<p>As stated in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, it is recognised that DMRB LA 112 is primarily for use when assessing transport-related developments. However, the guidance gives direction for assessing the impacts of a development on population and health and, in the absence of guidance, DMRB LA 112 provides a recognised method of</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.8.10-5.8.14 Agricultural &amp; Development Land</li> <li>- I believe this contradicts much of what was published in the Neighbourhood plan.</li> <li>- How can they position this as out of scope when they are taking 4200 acres of Best Most Valuable farmland out of production.</li> <li>• 5.8.15-5.8.18 Walkers Cyclists &amp; Horse Riders</li> <li>- They see no impact and indicate this should be out of scope. For all of these groups the significant change to the landscape will have a material impact.</li> <li>- We are meant to be promoting health and wellbeing and the countryside is a key element of this.</li> </ul>	<p>assessing the significance of population effects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private Property &amp; Houses – The ES includes specific criteria to assess potential impacts on private properties and residential areas, with a focus on identifying significant effects that can be mitigated where possible. The assessment has included air quality, noise, and visual impacts, with particular attention to views from residential properties. We are committed to implementing measures to reduce impacts on properties.</li> <li>• Community Land &amp; Assets - the Environmental Impact Assessment process includes assessments of landscape and visual impacts, biodiversity, and recreation, all of which aim to address the broader effects on the surrounding community and environment.</li> <li>• Agricultural &amp; Development Land - The approach taken is consistent with the Neighbourhood Plan and national planning policies for renewable energy developments.</li> </ul>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>We acknowledge the importance of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) farmland and have taken steps to minimize the area required for the development, while also planning for future land restoration after the development's operational phase. This commitment ensures that land will be suitable for agriculture upon decommissioning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Walkers Cyclists &amp; Horse Riders - The visual and landscape impact assessment has carefully considered effects on public rights of way and scenic views, and the design has integrated buffer zones and visual screening to reduce visual intrusion. The project also includes proposals for new or enhanced walking and cycling routes, as well as habitat creation, which can enhance the landscape character and biodiversity.</li></ul> <p>Further information regarding assessments for each environmental factor can be found in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6 to 15 [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>They say that in 40 years the site will be decommissioned and returned to prior condition. However if we consider 2.4.6, 2.4.19, 2.4.20, 2.4.21, 2.4.24, 2.4.27, 2.4.37, 2.4.38, 2.4.43, 2.4.48 this is clearly not going to happen. These areas are going to be covered in concrete to create hard standing platforms. This along with piling to create footings for the panels this land will never be used again for farming. What cast iron assurances will there be that ever piece of concrete will be removed from the land? Soil management 2.6.9 totally contradicts what's stated in 2.7.2 which states only stuff above ground will be dealt with</p>	<p>During the decommissioning phase, it is assumed that all concrete, hardstanding areas, foundations for the infrastructure and any internal tracks will be removed to a depth of up to 1m. It is assumed that all the below ground cables will be left in situ. Further detail is included within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Following decommissioning the land will be returned to the landowner for agricultural use. The land will be reinstated in accordance with the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> and <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b>. The <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> will be subject to the approval of the local planning authorities at the time of decommissioning.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Where does the significant amount of concrete required to convert this farmland into an industrial site meet any green credentials?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concrete pillars for the panels</li> <li>• Concrete under Independent Outdoor Equipment</li> <li>• Concrete under inverters &amp; Transporter Stations</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant has committed to minimise the use of concrete and foundations where practicable within the detailed design of the Proposed Development.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concrete in Collection Compounds</li><li>• Concrete in Substations Compounds</li><li>• Concrete in Battery Storage Areas</li><li>• Concrete in National Grid Substation Areas</li><li>• Concrete in Transmission Tower</li></ul>	<p>For areas of Solar PV development, the mounting structure of the Solar PV modules would be predominantly fixed to the ground using driven or helical piles which could easily be removed at decommissioning. Concrete footings would only be used where ground conditions restrict the use of piles, for example, where there are areas of sensitive archaeology. This would be secured by the <b>outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>.</p> <p>For other elements of the Proposed Development that require hardstanding, such as the BESS and compound areas, the layout would be designed to make the most efficient use of land and the extent of foundations would be limited to the minimum functional requirement.</p> <p>The full lifecycle assessment presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> takes into account the emissions associated with the use of concrete for the Proposed Development (including embodied emissions and transport emissions) and displays those emissions in tCO<sub>2</sub>e. The GHG savings of the Proposed Development outweigh the emissions associated with its construction,</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>There is going to be fencing at a minimum height of 2.5 metres up to 3m high, with CCTV up to 5 metres high also lighting. The CCTV is a gross intrusion into our human rights with security tracking our right to roam freely in the countryside. We should object strongly on the ground of privacy and human rights.</p>	<p>operation (including maintenance and replacement), and decommissioning, resulting in net GHG savings of over 9.6 million tonnes of CO2e.</p> <p>The CCTV system will be positioned away from any footpaths and sensitive receptors. Details of CCTV system are within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>This seems like an opportunity for the develop to materially change critical elements after a potential consent is granted. We should strongly object. With the resources available to EDF they should be in a position to fully scope and list everything before consent is granted.</p>	<p>The Rochdale Envelope is a common approach employed where the nature of the Proposed Development means that some details of the whole project have not been fixed when the application is submitted, and flexibility is sought to address uncertainty. It is important to maintain a degree of flexibility to ensure that the Proposed Development can use the most up-to-date technology and maximise any efficiencies such technology would enable.</p> <p>The Rochdale envelope assess a reasonable worst case and does not introduce opportunities for a project to be materially changed post-consent without the potential environmental effects of the change being properly considered.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Extensive network of Public Rights of Way have been in place for many years and were originally scoped by MR Eric Parker, these included 4 promoted walks. These walks will be fundamentally changed and spoilt. At a time when we are focussed so much on people's mental wellbeing this will have a significant detrimental impact.</p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has included breaks within the Solar PV development and removed fields of Solar PV development in several areas directly adjacent to the promoted walks.</p> <p>There will be no permanent closures of PRow and during construction closures will be minimised and managed in accordance with the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b>.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> has considered the change in the visual environment during the construction and the operational phases. Where possible; plants, hedges and trees will be retained or more will be planted in order to provide a visual barrier close to residential properties and Public Rights of Way (PRow). These proposals are secured and detailed in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>There are a significant number of Listed Heritage sites across the planned site. These sites will all have their outlooks spoilt by the development</p>	<p>The Environmental Impact Assessment has carefully considered the potential effects on listed heritage assets, including any changes to their settings and views.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>To minimise visual impacts, the design includes embedded mitigation measures such as strategic planting and screening to protect key views from these heritage sites. The layout of the development has also been designed to reduce direct visual interference with heritage assets wherever feasible.</p> <p>All listed buildings within 5km of the Site have been considered within the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. The masterplan has taken account of the listed buildings to minimise effects on them. Those identified in the stage 1 setting assessment as sensitive to changes in their setting due to their particular characteristics have been filtered for further assessment based on a worst case ZTV.</p>
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	There is already increased risk of flooding in the Scopwick area. The document 5.9.23 references Cook & McQueen (2013) when discussing runoff and potential impacts on flooding. This was a modelled classroom study on a tiny scale. It did demonstrate a small increase. They cannot	To address flood risk, an Outline Drainage Strategy has been prepared and is included as an appendix to the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> (which forms an appendix to the <b>Flood Risk Assessment</b>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>seriously be using a classroom-based study to take Water out of scope. The potential change to drainage on a site this large could be significant.</p>	<p><b>[EN010149/APP/7.16]</b>). This strategy confirms that the Proposed Development will not increase surface water runoff rates. Measures to manage drainage have been carefully designed to ensure that local flood risk will not worsen, particularly for nearby areas such as Scopwick and Kirkby Green, where historical drainage issues are noted.</p> <p>The design includes sustainable drainage measures to prevent additional strain on existing drainage systems and ensure that no increase in offsite flood risk occurs due to the solar panels or associated infrastructure. Further details on the flood risk and drainage management approach can be found in the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>The protection of Red Kite is the longest continuous Conservation project in the World. There are several nesting in and around Scopwick house.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Use of borrow pits - can the planning inspectorate guarantee that these sites won't be filled with construction contaminates and then back filled. Ref 5.7 materials, assets &amp; waste</p>	<p>No borrow pits are proposed as part of the Proposed Development.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	Why has no alternative site or source of power generation been considered.	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered</b>  <b>[EN01049/APP/6.1]</b> sets out the alternatives considered, including details on the design alternatives that have been undertaken, source of power generation considered, and the main reasons for discounting alternative design options.</p>
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	<p>WHERE POSSIBLE – there is zero commitment – the only part of the EIA that isn't concrete.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Panels shipped from China</li> <li>• Concrete on the Land</li> <li>• Alteration of Drainage</li> <li>• Removal of Best most valuable farmland out of production resulting in increase in import and the associated carbon footprint</li> </ul>	<p>During the decommissioning phase, it is assumed that all concrete, hardstanding areas, foundations for the infrastructure and any internal tracks will be removed to a depth of up to 1 m. It is assumed that all the below ground cables will be left in situ. Further detail is included within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>A drainage strategy has been developed and included in the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> (which forms an appendix to the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b>). This strategy confirms that the Proposed Development will not increase surface water runoff rates. Measures to manage drainage have been carefully designed to ensure that local flood risk will not worsen, particularly for</p>



**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

nearby areas such as Scopwick and Kirkby Green, where historical drainage issues are noted.

The design includes sustainable drainage measures to prevent additional strain on existing drainage systems and ensure that no increase in offsite flood risk occurs due to the solar panels or associated infrastructure. Further details on the flood risk and drainage management approach can be found in the **Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]**.

An assessment of Agricultural Land Classification data is presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]** and the **Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]**, which demonstrates compliance with applicable planning policy. The assessments concluded that 42.3% of the land within the Order Limits is classified as BMV agricultural land. Construction activities are not expected to impact the soil resource enough to cause a reclassification to a lower agricultural land grade.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	<p>How can they look to make utilities out of SCOPE                      There is a significant risk with the Exolum Pipeline that crosses the Blankney estate. This pipeline is a critical piece of infrastructure and needs to be accessed at anytime.</p>	<p>Following decommissioning the land will be returned to the landowner for agricultural use. The land will be reinstated in accordance with the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> and <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b>. The <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> will be subject to the approval of the local planning authorities at the time of decommissioning.</p> <p>We are aware of the Exolum Pipeline and have consulted with the relevant consultees to ensure that sufficient offset distances from any development are incorporated. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	<p>Whilst during the construction phase there may be a few extra hotel/B&amp;B rooms rented out the longer-term cost will be much higher as potential tourist will avoid the areas and the impact on property could be devastating</p>	<p>An assessment of impacts to tourism is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment concluded no significant effects and therefore there will be no impacts to occupancy.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>There was an Environment and Scrutiny Committee meeting at the County Council where it was apparent that at least 5 NSIPs are going through at the moment and there is a real risk that the grid cannot take it (which will mean not just solar panels but ore pylons and overhead cables).</p>	<p>The Proposed Development has a grid connection agreement with National Grid to connect into a proposed new substation (National Grid Navenby Substation).</p> <p>Further detail on the grid infrastructure and site selection is detailed within <b>Planning Statement, Appendix 1 – Site Selection Report [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>.</p> <p>Information about how the Proposed Development would connect into the National Grid can be found in the <b>Grid Connection Statement [EN010149/APP/7.6]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Regarding section 3.1.3 (Alternatives), I would like to propose that not just alternative sites but also alternative energy sources e.g. offshore wind farms are included. The chairman responded that this should be included in our response but it is highly likely that the Planning Inspectorate will say they are only considering that specific application.</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN01049/APP/6.1]</b> sets out the alternatives considered, including details on the design alternatives that have been undertaken, alternative energy sources considered, and the main reasons for discounting alternative design options.</p> <p>Further information about reasonable alternatives is included within the <b>Statement of Need [EN010149/APP/7.1]</b> and <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b> too.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>An attendee stated he has done research on lithium battery storage which will be predominantly on A15 area. There is a relevant Oxford University paper which he will pass on for inclusion on the website. There is a high level of danger with these units and the fire service have no guidance on dealing with lithium battery fires.</p>	<p>Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue has been consulted. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p> <p>The guidance published by the National Fire Chiefs Council in November 2022 has been considered.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue</b></p>		
<p><b>Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue</b></p>	<p>The developer should produce a risk reduction strategy (regulation 38 of the Building Regulations) as the responsible person for the scheme as stated in the regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. We would also expect that safety measure and risk mitigation is developed in collaboration with LFR. The strategy should cover the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the project. During the construction phase the number of daily vehicle movements in the local area will significantly increase. The Service will want to view the transport strategy to minimise this impact and prevent increase in the number of potential road traffic incidents. Any development should not negatively impact on the Service's ability to respond to an incident in the local area.</p>	<p>Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue has been consulted. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p> <p>Risk reduction strategies are detailed with the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.14]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted a Statement of Common Ground with Lincolnshire Fire &amp; Rescue Service as part of its DCO Application <b>Statement of Common Ground - Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service [EN010149/APP/7.24]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue</b></p>	<p>LFR recognises the use of batteries (including lithium-ion) as Energy Storage Systems (ESS) is a new and emerging practice in the global renewable energy sector. As with all new and emerging practices within the UK industry the service would like to work with the developers to better</p>	<p>Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue has been consulted in relation to the BESS. Details of consultation held to date are included</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue</b></p>	<p>understand any risks that may be posed and develop strategies and procedures to mitigate these risks.</p> <p>The developer must ensure the risk of fire is minimised by:                      Procuring components and using construction techniques which comply with all relevant legislation.                      The inclusion of Automatic Fire Detection systems in the development design.                      Including automatic fire suppression systems in the development design.                      Various types of suppression systems are available, but the Service's preferred system would be a water misting system as fires involving Lithium-ion batteries have the potential for thermal runaway. Other systems would be less effective in preventing re-ignition.                      Including redundancy in the design to provide multiple layers of protection.                      Designing the development to contain and restrict the spread of fire through the use of fire-resistant materials, and adequate separation between elements of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS).                      Developing an emergency response plan with the LFR to minimise the impact of an incident during construction, operation and decommissioning of the facility.                      Ensuring the BESS is located away from residential areas. Prevailing wind directions should be factored into the location of the BESS to minimise the impact of a fire involving lithium-ion batteries due to the toxic fumes produced.                      The emergency response plan should include details of the hazards associated with lithium-ion batteries, isolation of electrical sources to enable fire-fighting activities, measures to extinguish or cool batteries involved in fire, management of toxic or flammable gases, minimise the environmental impact of an incident, containment of fire water run-off,</p>	<p>within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant is applying industry best practice to the design of the BESS system, including the use of the NFCC (National Fire Chief Council) Guidance "Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS" and NFPA (National Fire Protection Association) 855 "Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems".</p> <p>The Applicant has investigated BESS (Battery Energy Storage System) safety and fire risk from a thermal runaway event and identified suitable mitigation measures, which are detailed within the <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.14]</b> and the <b>BESS Plume Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.19]</b>. These documents set out the very low likelihood of such an event (1 in 7700 years, an aggregate figure which accounts for all example BESS enclosures within the compound) along with the worst case impacts that might occur. The <b>BESS Plume Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.19]</b> demonstrates that if</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>handling and responsibility for disposal of damaged batteries, establishment of regular onsite training exercises.</p> <p>The emergency response plan should be maintained and regularly reviewed by the occupier and any material changes notified to LFR. Environmental impact should include the prevention of ground contamination, water course pollution, and the release of toxic gases.</p>	<p>a thermal runaway event were to occur, it would not pose significant risks to nearby human health receptors, including Toll Bar Cottages which is one of the closest residential receptors to the proposed BESS compound at around 440m to the south east. Harmful impacts are predicted to only occur within the tens of metres rather than hundreds of metres from the specific BESS enclosure involved in a thermal runaway event. Due to the low wind speed and lack of turbulence the cloud is anticipated to be less than 6m in width. The prevailing wind direction for the site is typically south-westerly. It should also be noted that the modelled plume remained well formed and showed a gradual rise to around 8m as it moves downwind, reducing the risk to people at ground level. The BESS site and enclosure design follows guidance to lay assets out in a manner that limits the ability for a thermal runaway event to spread to adjacent enclosures and nearby receptors, including Toll Bar Cottages. The Lincolnshire FRS will respond to any BESS event according to a mutually agreed Emergency Response Plan, which further reduces the risk to anyone in the vicinity or a thermal runaway event.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>The <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.14]</b> and <b>Appendix – Outline Drainage Strategy [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b>), set out example methods to collect, contain and manage any firefighting water runoff during an thermal runaway event. It also sets out drainage strategy for normal operation. This helps to avoid, control and mitigate the risk of contamination.</p> <p>The Applicant and Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service (FRS) have actively engaged since early stages of consultation, with ongoing discussions and agreements in place as to the suitable preventative measures and response for a thermal runaway event. The Applicant's draft design for the BESS compound has been reviewed and largely accepted, acknowledging the application of relevant guidance and best practice. Comments received from the Lincolnshire FRS have been incorporated into the design, <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.14]</b> and the <b>BESS Plume Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.19]</b>. Part of the mitigations discussed and agreed are in relation to the possible need for water to</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>cool adjacent enclosures in the event of a fire. If required, the BESS facility can accommodate sufficient water storage over and above the minimum required under NFCC guidance. Appropriate measures will be agreed with the Lincolnshire FRS during detailed design in order to account for all guidance at the time. The agreements with the Lincolnshire FRS are detailed in the <b>Statement of Common Ground - Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service [EN010149/APP/7.24]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue</b></p>	<p>The BESS facilities should be designed to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adequate separation between containers.</li> <li>- Provide adequate thermal barriers between switch gear and batteries,</li> <li>- Install adequate ventilation or an air conditioning system to control the temperature. Ventilation is important since batteries will continue to generate flammable gas as long as they are hot. Also, carbon monoxide will be generated until the batteries are completely cooled through to their core.</li> <li>- Install a very early warning fire detection system, such as aspirating smoke detection/air sampling.</li> <li>- Install suitable gas monitoring / detection that will support early detection of leaks/issues, within the BESS containers. Consider Volatile Organic Compound (VOC), sensors as they respond to droplets of organic solvent.</li> <li>- Consider the installation of internal suppression protection within BESS containers. Suitable systems/strategies should be installed / developed to ensure the fire does not propagate beyond a single cabinet.</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant is committed to developing a battery storage facility that will provide safe, dependable operation and has consulted the local fire and rescue service, Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service as part of developing the battery storage element of the Proposed Development. Prior to commencement of the construction of the BESS (Battery Energy Storage System), an emergency response plan will be prepared by the Applicant in consultation with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service and other relevant stakeholders. This will be maintained and reviewed regularly throughout the operating life of the BESS. The plan will be developed in accordance with National Fire</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>- Ensure that sufficient water is available for manual fire-fighting. An external fire hydrant should be located in close proximity of the BESS containers. – The water supply should be able to provide a minimum of 1,900 l/min for at least 120 minutes (2 hours). Further hydrants should be strategically located across the development. These should be tested and serviced at regular intervals by the operator. If the site is remote from a pressure feed water supply, then an Emergency Water Supply (EWS) meeting the above standard should be incorporated into the design of the site e.g. an open water source and/or tank(s). If above ground EWS tanks are installed, these should include facilities for the FRS to discharge (140/100mm RT outlet) and refill the tank.</p> <p>- The site design should include a safe access route for fire appliances to manoeuvre within the site (including turning circles). An alternative access point and approach route should be provided and maintained to enable appliances to approach from an up-wind direction.</p> <p>- As the majority of BESS are remotely monitored, consideration should include the fixing of an Information Box (IB) at the FRS access point. The purpose of the IB is to provide information for first responders e.g. Emergency Response Plan, to include water supplies for firefighting, drainage plans highlighting any Pollution Control Devices (PCDs) / Penstocks etc for the FRS.</p> <p>- Consideration of external visual indicator that allows effected area to be easily identified.</p> <p>LFR are aware that large scale BESS is a fairly new technology, and as such risks may or may not be captured in current guidance in pursuance of the Building Regulations (as amended) and the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. This will highlight challenges the FRS have when responding to Building Regulations consultations. For this reason, we strongly recommend applying the National Fire Protection Association</p>	<p>Chief Council guidance, other guidance and best practice in place at the time.</p> <p>The <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (Battery Commitments) [EN010149/APP/7.14]</b> sets out the key fire safety provisions for the BESS proposed to be installed at the Proposed Development including measures to reduce fire risk and fire protection measures including for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement and testing;</li> <li>• Safe BESS design;</li> <li>• Safe BESS construction;</li> <li>• Safe BESS operation; and</li> <li>• End of life/BESS disposal.</li> </ul> <p>Further detail on battery safety and fire risk (including toxic gases) in relation to the battery storage is included within the <b>BESS Plume Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.19]</b>.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.14]</b> has been produced which sets out the key fire safety provisions for the Battery Energy Storage System proposed to be installed at Springwell Solar Farm including measures</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>(NFPA) 855 Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems</p>	<p>to reduce fire risk and fire protection measures.</p> <p>Comments received from the Lincolnshire FRS have been incorporated into the design, <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.14] and the BESS Plume Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.19]</b>. Part of the mitigations discussed and agreed are in relation to the possible need for water to cool adjacent enclosures in the event of a fire. If required, the BESS facility can accommodate sufficient water storage over and above the minimum required under NFCC guidance. Appropriate measures will be agreed with the Lincolnshire FRS during detailed design in order to account for all guidance at the time. The agreements with the Lincolnshire FRS are detailed in the <b>Statement of Common Ground - Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service [EN010149/APP/7.24]</b>.</p> <p>Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue has been consulted in relation to the BESS. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>National Gas Transmission</b>		
<b>National Gas Transmission</b>	<p>National Gas Transmission operates 3 high pressure gas pipelines in the vicinity of the proposed solar farm. The site boundary doesn't appear to encroach on the pipelines or easements, but there is a potential risk of electrical interference from the proposed solar farm and battery energy storage systems. The developer will need to provide an earthing report and electrical risk assessment to show that the potential transfer voltages to the pipelines are within safe levels, and pre and post energisation surveys may be required. I would be happy to arrange a meeting with the developer to discuss the project</p>	<p>National Gas Transmission has been consulted and has confirmed that they are not impacted by the project and no protective provisions are required. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>
<b>National Gas Transmission</b>	<p>National Gas Transmission exercises its right to place a Holding Objection to the above proposal which will cross our High-Pressure Gas Pipeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would draw your attention to the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 1992, the Land Use Planning rules and PADHI (Planning Advise for Developments near Hazardous Installations) guidance published by the HSE, which may affect this development.</li> <li>• To visit the Land Use Planning site, please use the link below:  <a href="https://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/methodology.htm">https://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/methodology.htm</a></li> <li>• No buildings should encroach within the Easement strip of the pipeline</li> <li>• No demolition shall be allowed within 150 metres of a pipeline without an assessment of the vibration levels at the pipeline. Expert advice may need to be sought which can be arranged through National Gas Transmission.</li> <li>• National Gas Transmission has a Deed of Easement for each pipeline which prevents change to existing ground levels, storage of materials. It also prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings, or structures. If necessary National grid will take action to legally enforce the terms of the easement. Internal to Wipro</li> <li>• You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services", and</li> </ul>	<p>National Gas Transmission has been consulted and has confirmed that they are not impacted by the project and no protective provisions are required.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>National Gas Transmission's specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Gas Transmission High Pressure gas pipelines and associated installations - requirements for third parties T/SP/SSW22. You should already have received a link to download a copy of T/SP/SSW/22, from our Plant protection Team, which is also available to download from our website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To view the SSW22 Document, please use the link below: <a href="https://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/gas-transmission/document/113921/download">https://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/gas-transmission/document/113921/download</a></li><li>• A National Gas Transmission representative will be monitoring the works to comply with SSW22.</li><li>• To download a copy of the HSE Guidance HS(G)47, please use the following link: <a href="http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/books/hsg47.htm">http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/books/hsg47.htm</a></li><li>• National Gas Transmission will also need to ensure that our pipelines access is maintained during and after construction.</li><li>• Our pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a National Gas Transmission representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased.</li><li>• If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of National Gas Transmission High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a National Gas Transmission representative. A safe working method must be agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline.</li><li>• Excavation works may take place unsupervised no closer than 3 metres from the pipeline once the actual depth and position has been has been</li></ul>	

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>confirmed on site under the supervision of a National Gas Transmission representative. Similarly, excavation with hand held power tools is not permitted within 1.5 metres from our apparatus and the work is undertaken with NGT supervision and guidance.</p>	
<p><b>National Gas Transmission</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at locations agreed with a National Gas Transmission engineer.</li> <li>• All crossing points will be fenced on both sides with a post and wire fence and with the fence returned along the easement for a distance of 6 metres.</li> <li>• The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the National Gas Transmission pipeline without the prior permission of National Gas Transmission. National Gas Transmission will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed protective measure. The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to National Gas Transmission.</li> <li>• Please be aware that written permission from National Gas Transmission is required before any works commence within the National Gas Transmission easement strip. • A National Gas Transmission representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline to comply with National Gas Transmission specification T/SP/SSW22. Internal to Wipro</li> <li>• A Deed of Indemnity is required for any crossing of the easement including cables</li> </ul>	<p>National Gas Transmission has been consulted and has confirmed that they are not impacted by the project and no protective provisions are required. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>National Gas Transmission</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cables may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees.</li> </ul>	<p>National Gas Transmission has been consulted and has confirmed that they are not impacted by the project and no</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A National Gas Transmission representative shall supervise any cable crossing of a pipeline.</li> <li>• An impact protection slab should be laid between the cable and pipeline if the cable crossing is above the pipeline.</li> <li>• Where a new service is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service must cross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres.</li> </ul> <p>All work should be carried out in accordance with British Standards policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BS EN 13509:2003 - Cathodic protection measurement techniques</li> <li>• BS EN 12954:2001 - Cathodic protection of buried or immersed metallic structures – General principles and application for pipelines</li> <li>• BS 7361 Part 1 - Cathodic Protection Code of Practice for land and marine applications.</li> </ul>	<p>protective provisions are required. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>National Gas Transmission</b></p>	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Gas Transmission plc's apparatus and the proposed work location. Based on the location entered into the system for assessment the area has been found to be within the High Risk zone from National Gas Transmission plc's apparatus and you <b>MUST NOT PROCEED</b> without further assessment from Asset Protection.</p>	<p>Noted. Following the initial assessment, we reached out to National Grid's Asset Protection team as directed. Subsequently, we coordinated directly with National Gas Transmission's legal team to address the protective provisions more effectively. National Gas has now completed the further assessment mentioned in the Scoping Opinion, and they have confirmed that they are satisfied and they will not be impacted by the Proposed Development.</p>
<p><b>National Gas Transmission</b></p>	<p>BEFORE carrying out any work you must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure that no works are undertaken in the vicinity of our gas pipelines and that no heavy plant, machinery or vehicles cross the route of the pipeline until detailed consultation has taken place.</li> </ul>	<p>National Gas Transmission has been consulted and has confirmed that they are not impacted by the project and no protective provisions are required. Details</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carefully read these requirements including the attached guidance documents and maps showing the location of apparatus.</li> <li>- Contact the landowner and ensure any proposed works in private land do not infringe National Gas Transmission's legal rights (i.e. easements or wayleaves). If the works are in the road or footpath the relevant local authority should be contacted.</li> <li>- Ensure that all persons, including direct labour and contractors, working for you on or near National Gas Transmission's apparatus follow the requirements of the HSE Guidance Notes HSG47 - 'Avoiding Danger from Underground Services' This guidance can be downloaded free of charge at <a href="http://www.hse.gov.uk">http://www.hse.gov.uk</a></li> <li>- In line with the above guidance, verify and establish the actual position of mains, pipes, cables, services and other apparatus on site before any activities are undertaken.</li> </ul>	<p>of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>National Gas Transmission</b></p>	<p>DURING any work you must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure that the National Gas Transmission requirements are followed for work in the vicinity of High pressure pipelines including the supervision of the digging of trial holes.</li> <li>- Comply with all guidance relating to general activities and any specific guidance for each asset type as specified in the Guidance Section below.</li> <li>- Ensure that access to National Gas Transmission apparatus is maintained at all times.</li> <li>- Prevent the placing of heavy construction plant, equipment, materials or the passage of heavy vehicles over National Gas Transmission apparatus unless specifically agreed with National Gas Transmission in advance.</li> <li>- Exercise extreme caution if slab (mass) concrete is encountered during excavation works as this may be protecting or supporting National Gas Transmission apparatus.</li> </ul>	<p>National Gas Transmission has been consulted and has confirmed that they are not impacted by the project and no protective provisions are required. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>National Gas Transmission</b></p>	<p>- Maintain appropriate clearances between gas apparatus and the position of other buried plant.</p> <p>NGT has three feeder mains located within the vicinity of the Order limits near Scopwick and Kirkby Green however these are currently located to the East outside of the Order limits. The closest pipeline is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Feeder Main 24 – Hatton to Silk Willoughby</li> </ul>	<p>National Gas Transmission has been consulted and has confirmed that they are not impacted by the project and no protective provisions are required. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>National Grid</b></p>		
<p><b>National Grid</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NGET's Overhead Line/s is protected by a Deed of Easement/Wayleave Agreement which provides full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our asset</li> <li>▪ Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times. Any proposed buildings must not be closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor. NGET recommends that no permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines. These distances are set out in EN 43 – 8 Technical Specification for “overhead line clearances Issue 3 (2004)”.</li> <li>▪ If any changes in ground levels are proposed either beneath or in close proximity to our existing overhead lines then this would serve to reduce the safety clearances for such overhead lines. Safe clearances for existing overhead lines must be maintained in all circumstances.</li> <li>▪ The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing overhead lines is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's (www.hse.gov.uk) Guidance Note GS 6 “Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines” and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.</li> </ul>	<p>National Gas Transmission has been consulted and has confirmed that they are not impacted by the project and no protective provisions are required. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Plant, machinery, equipment, buildings or scaffolding should not encroach within 5.3 metres of any of our high voltage conductors when those conductors are under their worst conditions of maximum “sag” and “swing” and overhead line profile (maximum “sag” and “swing”) drawings should be obtained using the contact details above.</li> <li>▪ If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the proposal, we request that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead line to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances.</li> <li>▪ Drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they have the potential to disturb or adversely affect the foundations or “pillars of support” of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation (“pillar of support”) drawings can be obtained using the contact details above.</li> <li>▪ NGET high voltage underground cables are protected by a Deed of Grant; Easement; Wayleave Agreement or the provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act. These provisions provide NGET full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our assets. Hence we require that no permanent / temporary structures are to be built over our cables or within the easement strip. Any such proposals should be discussed and agreed with NGET prior to any works taking place.</li> <li>▪ Ground levels above our cables must not be altered in any way. Any alterations to the depth of our cables will subsequently alter the rating of the circuit and can compromise the reliability, efficiency and safety of our electricity network and requires consultation with National Grid prior to any such changes in both level and construction being implemented.</li> </ul>	
<b>National Highways</b>		
<b>National Highways</b>	It is noted that the site will not be accessed directly from the SRN and is located far enough from the SRN that there should be no physical impacts	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>to our network. Consequently, we would have no comments regarding site access or boundary matters.</p>	
<p><b>National Highways</b></p>	<p>It is anticipated that during normal operations vehicle trips to the site for maintenance purposes will be minimal. In view of this, we are unlikely to have any concerns relating to traffic impacts on our network once the site is operational, particularly considering the distance from our network.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>National Highways</b></p>	<p>According to the scoping document, construction is indicatively scheduled to commence in 2026 and last for approximately 48 months across two phases. This will be followed by a commissioning period of approximately six months. It is stated that a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and Environmental Statement (ES) will be produced to provide further details on the proposed construction activities.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement will include a Traffic &amp; Transport chapter informed by a transport assessment. National Highways is appropriately listed as a key consultee in this regard. The scoping report however suggests a study area to include the B1189, B1188, B1191, and A15. Routes managed by National Highways are not mentioned. Whilst it may not be necessary to include the Strategic Road Network in the detailed study area, National Highways will require information on the number of HGVs that will be travelling on the SRN to transport materials and equipment to the site. We also require an understanding of the time of day they will likely be arriving and leaving. Information regarding the access and exit routes and arrival/departure times of workers during the construction period should also be provided to enable sufficient understanding and management of construction traffic and to minimise impacts on the SRN.</p> <p>The above information is necessary to understand the potential impact of construction traffic on the SRN and whether it will be necessary to include any parts of the SRN in the study area for the transport assessment.</p>	<p>Usage of the B1188, B1191, and A15 for construction traffic use was identified and therefore these were included to the study area. After discussions with Lincolnshire County Council it was agreed for the exclusion of the B1189 and the inclusion of the B1202 in the ongoing assessments relating to construction traffic to those links discussed during scoping.</p> <p>The nearest part of the Strategic Road Network to the Site is the A1. It is anticipated that construction traffic volumes will have substantially dispersed by the time it reaches the A1. However, the ES and Transport Assessment considers the likely volumes of traffic that will be travelling along the Strategic Road Network (SRN) which is minimal and not significant.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) and impacts on the SRN are considered within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The SRN is considered in detail in the <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 14.1: Transport Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and concluded that impacts are expected to be limited.</p>
<b>NATS</b>		
<b>NATS</b>	<p>The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company (NERL) has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.</p> <p>However, please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NATS (that is responsible for the management of en route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly consulted.</p> <p>If any changes are proposed to the information supplied to NATS in regard to this application which become the basis of a revised, amended or further application for approval, then as a statutory consultee NERL requires that it be further consulted on any such changes prior to any planning permission or any consent being granted.</p>	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Natural England</b>		
<b>Natural England</b>	The proposal is unlikely to adversely impact any European or internationally designated nature conservation sites or nationally designated sites and has not triggered a current Natural England Impact Risk Zone.	Noted.
<b>Natural England</b>	The Environmental Statement should include in-combination/cumulative assessment of the whole development proposal. Section 7 of the EIA Scoping Report discusses the need for cumulative assessment, and the methodology to be used in this assessment. Natural England would like to note the significant number of Solar projects currently proposed in Lincolnshire and the East Midlands. These projects include Cottam Solar Project, West Burton Solar Project, Tillbridge Solar Project, Heckington Fen Solar Project, Gate Burton Solar Project, Mallard Pass Solar Project. As such, it is important that all possible cumulative impacts from these projects on the environment are considered within the ES.	Noted.  Assessment of intra-project effects and inter- project effects is included within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative effects [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> . This chapter considers these projects and includes a regional assessment of impacts to BMV land.
<b>Natural England</b>	Section 6.6.5 of the Scoping Report indicates that national level data shows the site contains a high proportion of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land. It is also noted that an ALC survey is currently underway across the site, which is welcomed. This should normally be at a detailed level, e.g. one auger boring per hectare, (or more detailed for a small site) supported by pits dug in each main soil type to confirm the physical characteristics of the full depth of the soil resource, i.e. 1.2 metres. The survey should cover the entire site, including any proposed cable routes. In order to both retain the long-term potential of this land and to safeguard all soil resources as part of the overall sustainability of the whole development, it is important that the soil is able to retain as many of its many important functions and services (ecosystem services) as possible.	An assessment of Agricultural Land Classification data is presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b> , which demonstrates compliance with applicable planning policy. The assessments concluded that 42.3% of the land within the Order Limits is classified as BMV agricultural land.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>The following issues should be considered and included as part of the Environmental Statement (ES):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The degree to which soils would be disturbed, damaged or lost as part of the development. This should include a breakdown of temporary and permanent impacts to soils (including amounts and proportions of BMV land) from all parts of the development, including, but not necessarily limited to: Solar PV panel areas, substations and other associated infrastructure, cable routes and biodiversity enhancement areas.</li> <li>- The ES should set out details of how any adverse impacts on BMV agricultural land can be minimised through site design. The results of the ALC survey should be used to influence the site design; areas of BMV land should be avoided wherever possible.</li> <li>- The ES should also set out details of how any adverse impacts on soils can be avoided or minimised and demonstrate how soils will be sustainably used and managed, including consideration of areas for green infrastructure or biodiversity net gain. The aim will be to minimise soil handling and maximise the sustainable use and management of the available soil to achieve successful after-uses and minimise offsite impacts. A Soil Management Plan should be used to prevent unacceptable impacts to the soil resource on the site</li> </ul>	<p>Agricultural land survey has been undertaken at one auger per hectare. Further detail is provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, and ALC reports provided in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.1A: Springwell Central Agricultural Land Classification; Appendix 11.1B: Springwell East, Lincolnshire Agricultural Land Classification; and Appendix 11.1C: Springwell West, Lincolnshire Agricultural Land Classification [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>Construction activities are not expected to impact the soil resource enough to cause a reclassification to a lower agricultural land grade. The duration of the operational Proposed Development is 40 years per phase. The majority of the land area to be occupied by Springwell Solar Farm will be returned to agricultural land use after the development has been decommissioned (40 years per phase), and as part of the Development Consent Order there will be legal requirements to ensure the Site is returned to agricultural land. An <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> is submitted in support of the Development</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Natural England</b>	<p>The ES should consider any impacts upon local wildlife and geological sites, including local nature reserves. The ES should set out proposals for mitigation of any impacts and if appropriate, compensation measures and opportunities for enhancement and improved connectivity with wider ecological networks. Consultation should therefore take place with the Ecology Officers for Lincolnshire County Council. Non-statutory consultees such as the Wildlife Trusts should also be approached; we note the stated intention to consult Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.</p>	<p>Consent Order Application. It is noted that an increase in soil quality is likely to be achieved due to the nutrient content of the soil improving while the soil is not employed for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>Impacts to agricultural land and soil are managed through the construction and operational phase by the implementation of the <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>.</p> <p>The ES considers any impacts upon local wildlife and geological sites. It sets out proposals for mitigation of any impacts and if appropriate, compensation measures and opportunities for enhancement and improved connectivity with wider ecological networks. Consultation meetings have been undertaken with North Kesteven District Council, Lincolnshire County Council and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and has informed the design and ES.</p> <p>Details on impacts upon local wildlife are considered in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Details on impacts upon geological sites are considered in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Natural England</b>	<p>The ES should assess the impact of all phases of the proposal on protected species. We note preliminary surveys have taken place and that the ES will provide details of any proposed mitigation measures required. Consideration should be given to the wider context of the site, for example in terms of habitat linkages and protected species populations in the wider area. Natural England's standing advice<sup>1</sup> provides guidance on how protected species should be dealt with in the planning system. The Standing Advice should not be treated as giving any indication or providing any assurance in respect of European Protected Species (EPS) that the proposed development is unlikely to affect the EPS present on the site; nor should it be interpreted as meaning that Natural England has reached any views as to whether a licence may be granted.</p>	<p><b>11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1].</b></p> <p>The design principles are to avoid habitats of high ecological value and enhance/ or create habitats and linkages/wildlife corridors to mitigate habitat loss and provide benefit to priority and notable species.</p> <p>The surveys have followed best practice guidelines. Further targeted surveys were carried out once design details were updated to inform the design and mitigation in order to avoid adverse impact. Natural England's Discretionary Advice Service has been sought on survey methods and will be sought if any EPS licences are likely required.</p>
<b>Natural England</b>	<p>The ES should include a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment and Habitat Management Plan. We note the intention to include a LEMP, which should encompass the information required to explain how the site will continue to be managed for the lifetime of the development. In Addition, the Habitat Management Plan (or LEMP) should also provide details on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Retention and enhancement of existing habitat features such as hedgerows, woodland and ponds;</li> <li>- ensuring created habitats establish and any remedial actions should they fail to establish initially;</li> <li>- proposed habitat connectivity to surrounding habitats which would contribute to the wider Nature Recovery Network.</li> </ul>	<p>A Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment using the DEFRA Metric 4.0 and Habitat Management Plan is included in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> and <b>Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> includes the information required to explain how the site</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>The EIA Scoping Report notes that a substantial net gain in biodiversity will be achieved, however, no specific reference to Biodiversity Net Gain, or use of the DEFRA Metric, has been made. We recommend that a biodiversity Net Gain assessment is carried out, using the Defra Biodiversity Metric 4.0, to quantify the gains created for biodiversity. 1 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals">https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals</a> Although government intends to mandate measurable biodiversity net gain for all new development at present there is no mandatory requirement to do this for NSIPs until 2025. We therefore advise that taking the net gain approach would make this development exemplary and would be illustrative of the intent to work to benefit the environment through development. Natural England would be pleased to advise on any plan of action regarding BNG. Please be advised that the Defra metric should not be used to assess impacts and calculate compensation for habitat damage or loss in designated sites or irreplaceable habitats. Any impacts on such habitats and sites should be assessed in accordance with planning policy and via the environmental assessment.</p>	<p>will continue to be managed for the lifetime of the development.                  Details of habitat creation, habitat connectivity and enhancement proposals are in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Natural England</b></p>	<p>The proposal is not located within or in the distinctive setting of the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Nonetheless, the ES should include an assessment of local landscape character through the consideration of the relevant National Character Areas and any local landscape character assessments. We would expect the following forms of guidance to be used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' (3rd Edition) (GLVIA3), Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2013;</li> <li>• 'An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment', Natural England, 2014: and</li> </ul>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> considers local landscape character with reference to National Character Areas and local landscape character assessments. Relevant best practice guidance documents including those highlighted here are referenced as appropriate in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Visual Representation of Development Proposals Technical Guidance Note’ 06/19, Landscape Institute, 2019.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Natural England</b></p>	<p>Measures to help people to better access the countryside for quiet enjoyment and opportunities to connect with nature should be considered. Such measures could include reinstating existing footpaths or the creation of new footpaths, cycleways, and bridleways. Links to other green networks and, where appropriate, urban fringe areas should also be explored to help promote the creation of wider green infrastructure. Access to nature within the development site should also be considered, including the role that natural links have in connecting habitats and providing potential pathways for movements of species. Relevant aspects of local authority green infrastructure strategies should be incorporated where appropriate. We note there is an extensive network of public rights of way within the site which link with the surrounding settlements. We would expect access to these to be retained and temporary diversions placed as necessary. There may also be opportunities for new permissive paths and linkages to existing paths, as well as for improving the interpretation of the countryside, the solar project and the biodiversity enhancements that it may bring, via the use of measures such as interpretation boards.</p>	<p>Existing Public Rights of Way within the Site has been retained.</p> <p>Based on feedback from non-statutory consultation, the Proposed Development has explored several Rights of Way improvements and permissive paths within the Site to connect existing routes and settlements. Further information is detailed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Natural England</b></p>	<p>Annex A Provides Natural England’s general advice on the scope of all Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA). Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again. We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact us. For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter please contact [REDACTED] Please send any</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Natural England has been consulted through the design of the Proposed Development and we thank them for their ongoing engagement.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	new consultations or further information on this consultation to [REDACTED]	
<b>Newark &amp; Sherwood District Council</b>		
<b>Newark &amp; Sherwood District Council</b>	I can advise that Newark & Sherwood District Council have no comments to make on the Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report (by RSK Environmental Limited Dated March 2023).	Noted.
<b>NHS Lincolnshire Integrated Care Board</b>		
<b>NHS Lincolnshire Integrated Care Board</b>	NHS Lincolnshire Integrated Care Board does not have any comments to make.	Noted.
<b>Norfolk County Council</b>		
<b>Norfolk County Council</b>	Give then location of the development I can confirm that the County Council does not have any comments to make on this project	Noted.
<b>North East Lincolnshire Council</b>		
<b>North East Lincolnshire Council</b>	I can confirm there are no comments to make.	Noted.
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>		
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	Paragraph 5.8 of the advice note recommends that applicants undertake their own non statutory consultation with the consultation bodies, or others, prior to submission of a Scoping Request to allow for refinement of options ahead of the formal request. It notes that applicants may choose to consult on preferred sites or solutions.	Non-statutory consultation was undertaken in January – March 2023 prior to the submission of the Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report. Details of consultation held to date are included

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>Paragraph 5.9 then cautions that applicants should consider carefully the best time to request a scoping opinion, and that “in order to gain the most benefit, applicants should consider requesting the opinion once there is sufficient certainty about the design of the Proposed Development and the main design elements likely to have a significant environmental effect” Continuing, it advises that applicants “should avoid submitting requests with multiple and varied design and layout options” however that if this cannot be avoided and options remain under consideration (for example a number of route corridors associated with a proposed linear development) “applicants should be aware that this may affect the ability of the Planning Inspectorate and consultation bodies to provide detailed comments”. Finally, paragraph 5.9 notes that “should a high level of uncertainty remain around key design elements of the Proposed Development this is likely to limit the Planning Inspectorate’s ability to agree to scope out aspects/matters to enable the refinement of the ES”</p>	<p>within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p> <p>Noted. Further detail on the reasonable alternatives and design options are presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>Paragraph 2.2.7 of the Scoping Report notes that further detail on draft design approach that is being used to inform the EIA is presented in Section 2.4 and that design parameters will be further developed for statutory consultation and presented in the PEIR, with final parameters and limits of deviation presented in the ES, draft order and works plans. Whilst we accept that design parameters and layout will evolve as the scheme progresses, as above the Council’s view is that there is insufficient detail across the collective Scoping Report including its Appendices to provide any meaningful feedback even in relation to preliminary design considerations.</p>	<p>Noted. Preliminary design parameters are detailed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 2.3.2 of the Scoping Report confirms that elements of the proposals will be permanent; notably the National Grid Substation. The NGS is confirmed as a component of the scheme at paragraph 2.4.1. The applicant will need to ensure that the respective sections of the ES dealing specifically with the NGS acknowledge and address this matter when applying significance criteria and the overall assessment of effects. In many cases the emerging overall assessment, where presented in the Scoping Report, highlights the temporary/reversible nature of the development when drawing those initial conclusions however clearly this will not be the case for the NGS.</p> <p>Mindful that the NGS is likely to be permanent operational development that is not decommissioned at/ahead of the 40-year lifetime of the solar park, the Council considers it likely that this will increase the prospect and probability that the solar park would seek repowering or partial repowering beyond 40 years. Whilst we appreciate that such a scheme is not before PINS and they are required to consider the Scoping Report as submitted we would request that this potential scenario is accounted for.</p>	<p>The National Grid Substation no longer forms part of the Proposed Development. The Solar PV development including the Springwell Substation and BESS are considered to be temporary with an operational life of 40 years per phase.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 2.4.7 of the Scoping Report states that the mounting structure carrying the solar PV modules will be designed to face southwards on a single-axis tracker or on a tracking platform. Both options should be considered specifically in the context of LVIA, glint and glare and noise. Paragraphs 2.4.17, 23, 25, 34, 37, &amp; 43 – as above there are significant unknowns in terms of the location, layout and composition of the BOSS, BESS and NGS. It is clear that different configuration options are currently being considered for the inverters, transformers and switchgears. 4 The ES will need to assess all options being considered at this stage (e.g. string or centralised inverters; independent outdoor or contained indoor equipment) and any potential impacts arising from each of these (e.g. noise, landscape</p>	<p>As detailed in the Proposed Development description presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, fixed mounting structure is the only option that is proposed. Tracking panels have since been discounted following further design development and environmental surveys.</p> <p>There are several options for the configuration for the Balance of Solar System which are detailed within <b>ES</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>and visual impact, etc) until or unless a decision is taken on which option would be used in advance of completing the ES.</p>	<p><b>Volume 1, Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, A worst case assessment has been undertaken for each environmental factor which is detail in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6 to 16 [EN0101049/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 2.4.61 of the Scoping Report states that the NGS compound, Project Substation compound, BESS compounds, and Collector Compounds would include lighting, in accordance with relevant standards, but will not be permanently lit. Whether scoped in or out of the ES, external lighting should be assessed in a lighting assessment to include consideration of glare, glow, lux levels and consideration of Environmental Zone (ILE standards) source intensity levels relative to the countryside location of the site.</p>	<p>There will be no permanent (continuous) lighting for security purposes except for at emergency exits as secured within the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>. Lighting sensors will be implemented around the Springwell Substation and BESS compound and CCTV system will include passive infra-red detectors around the Solar PV development to reduce the use of lighting and minimise light spill and any impacts to sensitive human and ecological receptors.</p> <p>It has been identified that lighting could cause disturbance to bats during construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning. Therefore, lighting has been considered within the ES, specifically within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity</b> and mitigation secured within the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>,</p>

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

**Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7] and Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10].**

The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7] and Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]** includes measures for the control of light during the construction and operation (including maintenance) phase respectively to ensure that effects are reduced (e.g. the use of lighting only when necessary and directing lighting downward, away from boundaries and vegetation; CCTV infrared lighting and no permanent lighting at night). Further detail on the type of lighting will be provided in the Construction Environmental Management Plan and Operational Environmental Management Plan following detailed design.

The **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP7.13]** identifies that decommissioning is to be undertaken in a sensitive manner and requires that any temporary lighting is operated in accordance with an agreed scheme.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	Paragraph 2.5.9 of the Scoping Report states that borrow pits might be used to source construction material. The relevant chapters of the ES must consider associated impacts, e.g. in relation to minerals impacts/potential sterilisation, groundwater/hydrology, noise/vibration, residential amenity, ecology and restoration of the pits. If proposed, the borrow pits must be included within the proposed Order Limits of the development.	A stand-alone glint and glare assessment has been undertaken and is provided as a technical appendix to the ES within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> .
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	With reference to paragraph 2.7.4 of the Scoping Report, as above the NGS is expected to be a permanent feature that needs to be factored into the overall assessment of impacts.	No borrow pits are proposed as part of the Proposed Development.
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	This section is focussed solely on alternative layouts and the 'no development' scenario; for example at paragraph 3.2.3 of the Scoping Report which states that 'the size, scale, and preferred location for key features (permanent and temporary) of the Proposed Development will require careful consideration as the design process evolves'. There is no specific reference to alternative sites, nor the degree to which the various environmental or other constraints will be factored into the search parameters in order to identify and potentially rule out (with evidence) what those alternatives are. It is accepted that the grid connection option is a key locational factor for solar farms however unlike the other known registered and pending NSIP solar schemes in Lincolnshire which have grid connection offers at existing substations via National Grid, in this case the export of energy requires a new NGS as part of the DCO. The Scoping	The National Grid Substation no longer forms part of the Proposed Development.  <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> sets out the alternatives sites, technologies and layout. Further detail on the alternative sites is detailed within <b>Appendix 1 Site Selection Report</b> within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b> .  The National Grid Navenby Substation and associated two 400kV transmission towers

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>Report states that up to two new 400kV transmission towers are needed to facilitate the electrical connection of the National Grid Substation to the existing 400kV transmission line and that the towers would be located within 50m of the existing 400kV overhead transmission line which crosses Springwell West. On this basis, in the absence of any other discussion or supporting information in the Scoping Report the 'reasonable alternatives' site search area is theoretically anywhere in a linear corridor along the identified 400kV circuit; which therefore encompasses expansive areas of land not only within the District but also outside the District and potentially beyond the Lincolnshire county boundary (in theory, nationally given this is an NSIP project and therefore locational need factors are not relevant and any other 400kV powerline network could potentially act as a connection point for a new national grid connection). 5 The search area proposed by the Council in relation to Heckington Fen Solar Park was county-level (in the context of NSIP-scaled solar farms registered with PINS in the West Lindsey/Bassetlaw and South Kesteven/Rutland districts) and in consideration of the grid connection options associated with those schemes. We requested that evidence should be provided from the National Grid confirming whether and why alternative connections into existing substations (for example Bicker Fen, Cottam, Ryhall, Spalding) could not be secured. In the Council's view the approach to considering alternative sites should initially start with the applicant evidencing why grid connections into these substations cannot be made. This should not be on the basis of simply ruling those out on the basis of an excessive grid connection distance; but to provide written evidence from National Grid of an inability to offer a connection point on capacity or other infrastructure grounds and the earliest timescale, where applicable, that an offer might be made. If this can be evidenced, the second element of that exercise is to then consider alternatives on the 400kV circuit (which passes through Springwell West) and which (as above) is in theory of considerable length.</p>	<p>no longer form part of the Proposed Development.</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>The assessment should have regard to environmental constraints including BMV land impacts and should not focus solely on land that is 'not BMV', but rather also areas that comprise lesser proportions of BMV. In terms of the 'site specific' consideration of alternatives (without prejudice to our comments in relation to alternative sites) we consider that the exercise also needs to consider alternative site layouts within Springwell east, central and west including potentially a reduction in MW generating capacity aligned with location of the respective Agricultural Land Classification Grades in order to demonstrate avoidance or minimisation of agricultural land impacts. As currently proposed we do not consider that the applicants proposed assessment of alternatives (in part by reference to Appendix B) is sufficient.</p>	
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 4.2.6 of the Scoping Report states that as part of the EIA process, the applicant will consult with a range of statutory and non-statutory consultees. Whilst noting that the subsequent list is not exhaustive, it does not include the MOD/DE/DIO, Internal Drainage Board, and RAF Cranwell and Waddington</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant has conducted an iterative programme of consultation and engagement to inform the design of the Proposed Development. This includes seeking the views of local people and local councils as part of formal consultation on the Proposed Development, as described in the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 4.3.1 of the Scoping Report notes that as the detailed design of the Proposed Development is still emerging, as are the environmental surveys and assessments required to support the planning and EIA process, the Scoping Report is provided based on the information available at the time of writing. It then advises that any changes to the scope of the EIA will be reported in the ES to reflect design and layout iterations and changes to reflect ongoing engagement. Paragraph 4.4.1 then notes that the study areas for respective chapters have been defined individually for</p>	<p>Further detail on the study area for each environmental factor is included within the <b>Statement of Need [EN010149/APP/7.1]</b>.</p> <p>Good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset. The project principles have been identified to ensure good design outcomes are embedded</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>each environmental factor, taking into account the geographic scope of the potential impacts relevant to that factor and the information required to assess those impacts. The Council does not support this approach and we would refer you back to PINS Advice Note 7 as referred to above. Table 4.1 sets out a series of mitigation measures for example offset/buffer distances from ecological receptors and noise separation distances to residential property. However, it is unclear how these have been defined and as such justification should be presented in the ES. In addition, the 'Land and Soils' section of that table states that 'The design of the Proposed Development will seek to retain fields comprising majority Grade 1 or Grade 2 agricultural land within arable production where possible'. However, there is no reference to sub-grade 3a (which also comprises BMV agricultural land) or commitment to either retain or reduce impacts thereto (see also below)</p>	<p>within the Proposed Development from the very start. These will be tested and refined as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and Development Consent Order process.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has been guided by principles to help reduce the use of higher grade agricultural land, where practicable. These include the below and are further detailed within the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b>.</p> <p>All fields comprising solely of Grade 1 or 2 land within the site will remain in arable production.</p> <p>Prioritise the use of BMV land for arable production where practicable.                      Prioritise the use on non-BMV land for the creation of legacy / permanent habitats where practicable.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 4.10.2 of the Scoping Report states that 'Enhancement measures will be assessed in accordance with steps set out in the National Planning Policy Framework'. This should be expanded to the range of national and local policy and guidance statements including the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2023) (including associated evidence base reports) and the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>The Proposed Development has been assessed in accordance with the relevant policies and will be part of the individual ES chapters and assessed within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>Paragraph 5.2.3 of the Scoping Report suggests that glint and glare can be excluded from the scope of the EIA, however, that a detailed stand-alone glint and glare assessment will be undertaken and submitted in support of the DCO Application, considering ground-based (residential dwellings, road, and rail) and airborne (airfields, Air Traffic Control Towers, and approaching aircrafts) receptors. Whilst each case must be considered on its merits, glint and glare impacts were scoped into the ES for the Heckington Fen Solar Farm however the Planning Inspectorate agreed that aviation impacts could be excluded. Mindful of the use of airspace above and around Springwell by the three RAF bases referred to, we recommend that PINS seek the advice of those bases in relation to potential glint and glare impacts, not least given that paragraph 2.4.7 of the Scoping Report references the potential use tracking panels. The March 2023 consultation draft 'National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)' states at paragraph 3.10.12 that 'Utility-scale solar farms are large sites that may have a significant zone of visual influence' and that 'the two main impact issues that determine distances to sensitive receptors are therefore likely to be visual amenity and glint and glare.' At this stage, in the absence of any detailed or indicative site layout options we would request that glint and glare is scoped into the ES. There are large concentrations of residential property as identified in the 'Appendix C – Environmental Features Plan' in particular around the northern edge of Scopwick, Kirkby Green, the southern and eastern edges of RAF Digby and at more scattered isolated dwelling and farmstead locations throughout the study area and where the suggested DCO/red line boundary immediate abuts those locations or is at least in very close proximity. 7 Whether or not PINS agree with this approach we would highlight paragraph 3.10.94 of the 2023</p>	<p>submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.</p> <p>A stand-alone glint and glare assessment has been undertaken and is provided as a technical appendix to the ES within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. The study concluded that solar reflections towards four aerodromes are considered to be operationally accommodatable, and a low impact is predicted. The Applicant is continuing to engage with these aviation receptors on the outcomes of the assessment.</p> <p>No significant impact is predicted upon road safety, residential amenity, and railway operations and infrastructure.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>consultation draft EN-3 which states that ‘Applicants should map receptors to qualitatively identify potential glint and glare issues and determine if a glint and glare assessment is necessary as part of the application’.                      Paragraph 3.10.95 then notes that ‘When a quantitative glint and glare assessment is necessary, applicants are expected to consider the geometric possibility of glint and glare affecting nearby receptors and provide an assessment of potential impact and impairment based on the angle and duration of incidence and the intensity of the reflection’.</p>	
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>With reference to paragraph 5.4.4 of the Scoping Report, the applicant also proposes to scope out the risk of major accidents and disasters, which they state will be considered throughout the design process of the Proposed Development and will include siting the potentially hazardous equipment, such as the BESS and grid infrastructure, at a suitable distance from sensitive receptors. Whilst PINS agreed to scope out a standalone Chapter for major accidents and disasters in consideration of the Heckington Fen Solar Farm, this was on the basis that ‘that the nature, scale, and location of the Proposed Development is not considered to be vulnerable to or give rise to significant impacts in relation to the risk of accidents and major disasters’. However, whilst not implicit in that Scoping Opinion, the BESS and grid infrastructure including probable composition and site area were identified on the indicative site plan with reasonable certainty at that time. In the case of Springwell, the Appendix B – Zonal Masterplan confirms significant unknowns and uncertainty in terms of the probable locations for the collector compounds and distributed BESS, the NGS and project substation across all three parcels. Some of these areas abut or are very close to concentrations of residential property or isolated dwellings and the A15. The degree of uncertainty and variability of layout at this stage suggests that the risk of accidents and disasters should be scoped in and where the applicant’s suggestion that this risk can be ‘designed out’</p>	<p>A management plan for battery safety has been prepared and is submitted with the Development Consent Order Application in a document entitled <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b>. The Battery Safety Management Plan details the regulatory guidance reviewed to ensure that all safety concerns around the BESS element of the Proposed Development are addressed in so far as is reasonably practicable. The Battery Safety Management plan was developed and agreed upon with Lincolnshire Fire Service, North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council.</p> <p>The risk of major accidents and disasters has been considered throughout the design process of the Proposed Development. This includes siting the</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>through subsequent design and layout iterations should be relied upon. A smoke plume assessment should also form part of this chapter.</p>	<p>potentially hazardous equipment, such as the BESS and grid infrastructure, at a suitable distance from sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Consideration of the risks associated with major accidents and disasters have been included in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. No significant effects in relation to major accidents and disasters are anticipated during the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>Impacts of major accidents and disasters are considered within <b>the BESS Plume Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.19]</b> and <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, with any relevant mitigation measures secured within the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>, <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> and <b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.14]</b> which are submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	Paragraph 5.6.1 of the Scoping Report states that consideration of the potential effects to human health as a result of the proposed development will be covered through the findings of other assessments undertaken as part of the EIA process. The Council agrees with this suggestion.	<p>The <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b> demonstrate how the design has been embedded to the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Noted. While human health has been scoped out of the ES, human health impacts in relation to dust and noise have been considered and assessed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration, Chapter 13: Population</b> and <b>Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> with any relevant mitigation measures secured within the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b> which is submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> outlines potential impacts of glint and glare that could cause nuisance to people living in nearby residential properties.</p> <p>Likely significant effects to human health are not expected as a result of the Proposed Development.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	Paragraph 5.7.1 of the Scoping Report defines material assets as 'substances used in each lifecycle stage of a development, with particular focus on the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning or 'end of first life' (deconstruction, demounting, demolition and disposal) phases" [Ref. 5-7]. Material assets can include 'material' (i.e. physical resources that are used across the lifecycle of a development) and 'excavated arisings' (i.e. soil, rock, or similar resource generated by excavations)'	Noted.
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	Paragraph 5.7.6 of the Scoping Report states that it is not intended to remove significant quantities of excavated arisings from the site during construction and that where possible, soil arisings will be balanced through a cut and fill exercise to retain volumes on site. However, there is no reference to the potential use of borrow pits, and relative to the Heckington Fen Solar Park the Springwell proposals are set across a significantly larger site area, with more variable topography and also comprise the NGS. Whilst the potential for minerals sterilisation is to be addressed in the 'Land, soils and groundwater' chapter, and other environmental effects associated with the potential use of borrow pits (for instance noise, historic environment, vibration, ecology/biodiversity) could be assessed elsewhere in other ES Chapters, the Planning Inspectorate should satisfy themselves that there is sufficient information available with the Scoping Report including the Appendix B – Zonal Masterplan to scope out this topic area.	No borrow pits are proposed as part of the Proposed Development.  A Mineral Safeguarding Assessment forms part of the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b> submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	Paragraph 5.8.1 of the Scoping Report states that the requirement to consider population in UK EIA practice was introduced via the 2017 update to the EIA Regulations, with impacts to population taken to refer to socio-economic impacts. There is no proposed ES chapter heading dealing solely with socio-economic impacts (instead the applicant suggests that 'Socio-Economic Benefits Statement' will be submitted in support of the DCO Application), however the Council suggests that there should be.	<b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> addresses socio-economic impacts including economic benefit, effects on employment, agricultural land holdings and agricultural jobs. Therefore a socio-economic benefit statement is no longer being submitted as

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>Paragraph 5.8.19 of the Scoping Report states that socio-economic benefits as a result of the Proposed Development are expected with regards to the increase in the level of temporary employment; the subsequent gross value added to the economy; the uptake in the occupancy rate for beds in local hospitality venues; and a small number of long term employment opportunities during operation. The Scoping Report identifies potentially negative effects associated with the inevitable removal of land from agricultural production and that there may be businesses/tenants/occupiers currently undertaking agricultural operations across the site boundary who may cease to do so for the duration of the operational phase of the development. However, there is no reference in the proposed scope to any socio-economic benefit enduring from continued agricultural use of part or all of the site</p>	<p>the required detail is included within Chapter 13.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> addresses socio-economic impacts including economic benefit, effects on employment, agricultural land holdings and agricultural jobs.</p> <p>During the construction phase there will be an increase in the level of employment available for local people in the construction sector and the associated supporting industries which is beneficial and significant. During operation there will be a small number of operational jobs created which is beneficial but not considered to be significant. As such there is likely to be a long term benefits to the area through the number of jobs created.</p>
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>Paragraph 6.6.8 of the Scoping Report (see also below) suggests scoping in the operational impacts of the proposed development in relation to the loss of agricultural and BMV land owing to the direct impact on its availability of such land, however there is no outline of any suggested mitigation measures. For example this could include enabling some continuance of agricultural activity through sheep grazing or alternative forms of cropping among panelled areas.</p>	<p>There is the potential to use the open spaces between the infrastructure and the land beneath the Solar PV modules for pastoral farming (sheep grazing) during the operation (including maintenance) phase, and therefore some agricultural use of the Site can occur during the lifespan of the Proposed Development. It should be noted</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>The applicant should therefore quantify whether and how there are socio-economic benefits stemming from a change from predominantly arable agricultural use of the site predevelopment to a solar and possibly pastoral use post-development. We suggest that the applicant should also identify a mechanism by which any changes in agricultural activity (and ergo any associated socio-economic effect) can be secured through the DCO process.</p>	<p>that although conditions suitable for grazing can be maintained, the Applicant will not be responsible for making arrangements for grazing.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has reduced the use of higher grade agricultural land, where practicable. Reasonable alternatives that were considered are provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>All fields comprising solely of Grade 1 or 2 land within the Site will remain in arable production.</p> <p>Several fields within the Order Limits will be required for installation of cabling, but will be returned to agricultural use after the cable has been laid (<b>ES Volume 2, Figure 3.1: Zonal Masterplan [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>).</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> addresses socio-economic impacts including economic benefit, effects on employment, agricultural land holdings and agricultural jobs. The population assessment concluded that</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Furthermore, Figure 7 'Visual Receptors' maps the location of the 'Stepping Out' and 'Spires and Steeples' walking routes through the study area. The lack of detail relating to site layout options means that there is a potential direct impact of these walking routes becoming surrounded by solar panels and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Walking, cycling and horse riding is a key visitor attraction/promotion for this part of the District and therefore potential socioeconomic effects and mitigation should be discussed.</p>	<p>during the construction phase there will be an increase in the level of employment available for local people in the construction sector and the associated supporting industries which is beneficial and significant. During operation there will be a small number of operational jobs created which is beneficial but not considered to be significant. As such there is likely to be a long term benefits to the area through the number of jobs created.</p> <p>Following further assessment work, Proposed Development have avoided placing solar panels in the fields alongside the B188 and the Spires and Steeples trail to retain the views between Scopwick and Blankey. The revised area of Solar PV development is displayed in <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 3.1: Zonal Masterplan [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> provides an assessment of effects on walkers, cyclists and horse riders as a result of temporary impacts to Public Rights of Way (PRoW). Results from the assessment identified that the new PRoW and improvements to</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>existing PRow including improvements to accessibility would have a beneficial effect on users of the PRow as it will enhance their wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b> has been submitted in support of the Development Consent Order application which includes measures to manage or temporarily close PRow within the study area during construction.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>There is limited information in the Scoping Report in relation to direct, indirect, temporary and permanent employment jobs created through construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning. This information should be presented along with identification of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ opportunities for using local businesses on various aspects of the construction phase;</li> <li>➤ how the applicant would go about supporting local business procurement;</li> <li>➤ financial estimates of economic benefits of the construction phase to the local economy including hotel spend etc;</li> <li>➤ opportunities to encourage apprenticeships; and</li> <li>➤ financial estimates and local opportunities associated with ongoing maintenance over the 40-year operational period</li> </ul> <p>In terms of potential economic benefits, the Council notes that an established way of calculating the extra value generated by local spend on</p>	<p>An assessment of employment, including direct, indirect, temporary and permanent jobs are presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The chapter uses Gross Value Added estimates to present the financial estimates and local opportunities associated with the Proposed Development. During the construction phase, a gross peak number of 650 construction staff could be onsite at one time. It is expected that the workforce will spend in the local economy which will help sustain jobs across various sectors during the construction phase. Based on the average Gross Value Added per construction worker of £67, 823, it is</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>contractors and services would be by using LM3 multipliers which the applicant might wish to consider depending on the certainty of construction contracts etc at this stage. The multiplier can be found at <a href="https://www.lm3online.com/">https://www.lm3online.com/</a>. Finally the Council only agrees that the sensitive receptor 'population' impacts can be scoped out as long as residential visual amenity effects are assessed in full in the LVIA chapter</p>	<p>estimated the gross value added to constructed the Proposed Development would equal around £27.1 million per year of construction. The decommissioning phase is anticipated to give rise to similar effects as those experienced during the construction phase.</p> <p>The Applicant has also prepared an <b>Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010149/APP/7.20]</b> which sets out how the Applicant would promote employment and skills opportunities for local people and opportunities for businesses to engage in the supply chain , which could result in economic benefits for the local and wider community.</p> <p>These could include work experience placements, access to jobs - from entry-level to skilled positions - and joint Apprenticeships across industry partners. Training and upskilling opportunities would be provided both for new entrants to the construction and renewable industry sectors and those seeking in-work progression. The Plan includes provision not only for opening up access to employment and skills opportunities on the solar energy farm site, but also within the Applicant organisations, including</p>

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

Apprenticeships and Graduate Entry positions. The Plan suggests that a process could be introduced whereby residents closest to the site are targeted, as a priority, for proactive awareness raising and recruitment drives.

The Plan includes provision for working with schools to promote the career opportunities available to young people within renewable industries, including, importantly, those available local to their place or residence. This would support the objective, shared by regional and local stakeholders, to encourage young people to invest their careers and futures within Lincolnshire rather than seek opportunities in other parts of the UK.

Population has been scoped into the assessment however, residential visual amenity effects are assessed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]**.

The Applicant acknowledges the suggestion of using the LM3 multiplier to provide financial estimates of the potential economic benefits generated by the Proposed Development. Following a

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.9.19, 5.9.23 and 5.9.32 of the Scoping Report describe how the development and utilisation of the site has the potential to result in marginal increased localised flood risk due to increases in impermeable area associated mainly with the infrastructure elements, but that the solar panels themselves will not result in a direct increase in impermeable area of the site as they will be raised above the ground level. It is also noted that only very limited parts of the site are located in flood zones 2 or 3. The Scoping Report states that in light of the above, it is proposed to exclude water from the scope of the EIA, subject to ensuring no deterioration of water quality or increase in flood risk and agreeing design and mitigation</p>	<p>similar methodology to the LM3 multiplier, the population assessment uses gross value-added data to determine the contribution of workforce spending, gva and the supply chain to the local economy. The assessment also uses leakage data derived from CITB survey data, to determine how much of the total economic contribution associated with the Proposed Development would be spent locally versus none locally. The assessment is two-fold and identifies significant effects on workforce spending, GVA and supply chain benefits on the Construction Labour Market Area (within 50 miles of the Order Limits) and the Construction Labor Market Area Focus Area (within 10 miles of the Order Limits), at both scales, there are no residual effects.</p> <p>Aspects of the water topic have been scoped in for further assessment and detailed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. However, flood risk has been agreed to be scoped out and is assessed as part of a flood risk assessment.</p> <p>To address flood risk, an Outline Drainage Strategy has been prepared and is</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>measures with the Environment Agency, Lincolnshire County Council (the Lead Local Flood Authority) and the Witham First Internal Drainage Board. Whilst the site is primarily underlain by limestone bedrock with some areas of sandstone, mudstone and siltstone, suggesting that infiltration methods might be appropriate, nevertheless the Council is aware that geotechnical and ground investigations have yet to be undertaken. On the basis of that uncertainty, and given the site area is significant with a number of possible site layout options not least the potential location of the BESS and NGC as well as their associated drainage requirements (impermeable surfacing), we consider that 'water' should be scoped in as a specific chapter in the ES. The Planning Inspectorate should therefore defer to the drainage consultees prior to scoping out this chapter, not least given the significant variability identified.</p>	<p>included as an appendix to the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> (which forms an appendix to the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b>). This strategy confirms that the Proposed Development will not increase surface water runoff rates. Measures to manage drainage have been carefully designed to ensure that local flood risk will not worsen, particularly for nearby areas such as Scopwick and Kirkby Green, where historical drainage issues are noted.</p> <p>The design includes sustainable drainage measures to prevent additional strain on existing drainage systems and ensure that no increase in offsite flood risk occurs due to the solar panels or associated infrastructure. Further details on the flood risk and drainage management approach can be found in the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b>.</p> <p>The principles of this drainage strategy are agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. <b>Table 15.1</b> from <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 15: Water [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> summarises the engagement with the Lead Local Flood Authority, Witham First Internal Drainage Board and the Environment</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Section 5.10.3 of the Scoping Report quotes Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) guidance, which alongside the 1998 guidelines published by International Commission on Non – Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) states that underground cables and overhead power lines at voltages up to and including 132 kV are not capable of exceeding the ICNIRP exposure guidelines. However, there is no reference to the proposed transmission towers and 400kv NGS connection.</p> <p>RAF Digby is the HQ of the Joint Cyber and Electromagnetic Activities Group and is located immediately west of Springwell Central. Paragraph 5.10.4 states that ongoing consultation will be held with RAF Digby throughout the design of the development to avoid any interference with their operations, and that it is proposed to exclude electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields from the scope of the EIA.</p> <p>The Scoping Report contains no discussion or analysis of potential electric, magnetic and electromagnetic field effects on the operations of RAF Digby, whether and how avoidance or mitigation of effects is to be adopted, and where the Appendix B – Zonal Masterplan identifies potentially suitable areas for the collector compounds and distributed BESS on land close to MOD property to the east of RAF Digby. As above section 5.10.3 only references ICNIRP guidelines in relation to the 132kv circuit. The Planning Inspectorate should therefore be guided by the relevant defence consultees before agreeing whether this topic should be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p>Agency on the matters of flooding and managing water to shape the approach to the assessment, overall no concerns to the management of flood risk have been raised.</p> <p>Noted. The MOD and RAF Digby have been consulted during the design of the Proposed Development and engagement is ongoing.</p> <p>The proposed transmission towers no longer form part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Views from RAF Digby have informed the proposed layout, and as noted in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, no above ground structures are proposed within immediately adjoining fields or within approximately 1km of the main residential barracks in Springwell West. A gentle ridge to the east of the B1181 (Heath Road) together with established woodland separates the residential barracks from Springwell Central. No significant effects are predicted to this non-designated heritage asset.</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>We have no objection to the issues to be scoped in to the Air Quality chapter at paragraph 6.1.8. There are no references to BESS and NG substation operational impacts however we note that operational air quality was not scoped into the ES for the Heckington Fen scheme.</p> <p>IAQM guidance advises the need for a construction dust assessment if there are human receptors within 50m of the boundary of the site, or within 50m of construction vehicle trackout routes, and if there are ecological receptors within 50m of the site boundary or the trackout routes. Whilst the site DCO boundary is noted, the layout of development is still fluid and therefore the need for a dust assessment should be reserved until the location of trackout routes and access etc are confirmed</p>	<p>A high-level electromagnetic assessment has been undertaken and can be found within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.5: High-level Electromagnetic Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. The study sets out the proposed siting zone for the cabling and includes an assessment of electromagnetic fields for underground cabling and transformer and substations. The assessment recommends a minimum clearance distance of 25m relative to public exposure limits for magnetic and electric fields and concludes that there would be no effects to sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Noted. Given the nature of the Proposed Development, operational phase air quality has been scoped out from the ES. A <b>BESS Plume Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.19]</b> is prepared and submitted in support of the Development Consent Order.</p> <p>Human receptors have been identified within 250 of the Order Limit and non-statutory designated sites have been identified within or adjacent the Site. An assessment of the dust emissions arising from construction and decommissioning activities is conducted and presented in the</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>Please find attached detailed comments from the Council's consultant ecologist, AECOM (Appendix 1). In summary;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ There is no reference to or commitment to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (see below)</li> <li>➤ We disagree that impacts on certain LWS's can be screened out (see below)</li> <li>➤ We disagree with the conclusion that there are no Ancient Woodlands impacted. The Ancient Woodland Inventory is not definitive and generally omits woodlands smaller than 2ha, therefore, the applicant should ensure that all woodlands in the zone of influence are considered.</li> </ul> <p>The summary survey scope (Section 6.2.4 of the Scoping Report) does not identify the methods to be applied or the survey timings. As a consequence, there is insufficient information to confirm that the survey work completed to date is appropriate and sufficient.</p> <p>Reptile surveys will be needed if the habitats of relevance cannot be avoided as indicated and the great crested newt survey scope does not confirm that the off-site ponds located within 500m of the proposed development have been surveyed for this species There is no reference to Wildlife and Countryside Act Schedule 1 bird species or notable flora and we disagree that the need for wintering bird surveys can be scoped out The reference to 'barns' at 6.2.2 (preliminary bat roost assessments) should be extended to 'buildings' given that these might also be used for roosting.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.2.9 of the Scoping Report states that impacts on LWS's at Blankney Brick Pit LWS, Temple Road Verges, Welbourn to Brauncewell 2 LWS, Slate House Farm to Dunsby Pit Plantation 1 LWS, Green Man Road to Cuckoo Lane 2 LWS and Bloxholm Wood LWS/Lincolnshire Wildlife</p>	<p>ES with reference to the IAQM 2024 construction dust guidance.</p> <p>Response provided in full in the below section: 'AECOM – consultant acting on behalf of North Kesteven district Council' on p.154.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>Trust reserve are to be scoped out as they 'are avoided by the current Proposed Development design'. However, as above no layout options have been presented and as such it is not confirmed that impacts have been avoided. Furthermore the paragraph states that the scheme will incorporate a minimum offset distance of 15m from Local Wildlife Sites however it is unclear how this 15m distance has been derived relative to the characteristics of each LWS. The Council therefore considers that they should be scoped into the assessment.</p> <p>Whilst paragraph 6.2.10 of the Scoping Report states that opportunities for ecological enhancement within the site are diverse, it also states that no specific enhancement measures have yet been agreed and that a detailed biodiversity design will be produced and implemented outlining how a substantial net gain in biodiversity will be achieved. Paragraph 3.10.119 of the 2023 draft EN-3 confirms that solar proposals should aim to achieve environmental and biodiversity net gain in line with the ambition set out in the Environmental Improvement Plan and any relevant measures and targets, 'including statutory targets set under the Environment Act or elsewhere'. A minimum BNG of 10% is therefore required although it is anticipated that development of this scale will be able to deliver considerably in excess of this.</p> <p>The applicant is advised that Local Ecological Network, Biodiversity Opportunity and Green Infrastructure Mapping, along with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy has been prepared for Central Lincolnshire by the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership. These maps and strategies identify the known existing areas of high biodiversity value and areas of local biodiversity priority where it is considered most important and feasible to target habitat creation, extension and restoration. The applicant should refer to these in the formulation of BNG proposals.</p>	

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.3.2 of the Scoping Report states that GHG emissions ‘will be estimated based upon project-specific data that may relate to activities outside the Site boundary (e.g., water provision and wastewater treatment outside of the Site boundary, or the embodied carbon within construction materials and solar PV modules as a result of the energy used for production).</p> <p>The Council requests that GHG emissions should also account for the replacement of panels and any other operational/infrastructure elements during the lifetime of operation, and the applicant should also address ‘alternatives’ in the context of GHG offset to reflect revised layouts or overall energy generation capacity in relation to BMV land considerations (see below). This must include manufacture, shipping etc.</p> <p>The approach to the assessment should consider the full life-cycle of the proposed development and potential sources of GHG emissions. GHG emissions offset through the production of lower carbon electricity compared to grid average emissions during the operational phase should also be accounted for within the GHG emissions calculations.</p> <p>The ES should incorporate sufficient detail on emissions calculations (estimated and actual) to cover pre-construction, construction phase, life time (including operational and maintenance) and decommissioning. Ideally this should include the expected payback period for all estimated emissions and ensure ongoing emissions are calculated during the lifetime of the proposal (est. 40 years).</p> <p>The Council also requests consideration of methods to increase in-situ carbon sequestration from effectively leaving the land fallow for the expected 40 years (in the absence of any details of agricultural land impact ‘mitigation’ at this stage). This could include low growing plants (e.g. sweet yellow clover and vetches) as part of a BNG strategy that could assist with increasing the organic content of the soil and locking carbon.</p>	<p>The full lifecycle assessment presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> takes into account the emissions associated with the manufacture and transport of materials and components from source countries (including China as a part of Asia) and displays those emissions in tCO<sub>2</sub>e. The GHG savings of the Proposed Development outweigh the emissions associated with its construction, operation (including maintenance and replacement), and decommissioning, resulting in net GHG savings of over 9.6 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>With reference to paragraph 6.4.1 of the Scoping Report, the applicant should also liaise with the Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire (on behalf of the Council) in relation to the scope of and timing of any intrusive evaluation following completion of the geophysical survey. The Scoping Report states that Lincolnshire County Council has also approved a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for geophysical survey of the site. This was not discussed or agreed in advance with North Kesteven District Council and therefore we reserve the right to make representations on its scope.</p> <p>With reference to paragraph 6.4.2 of the Scoping Report, we recommend that a 5km buffer from the site boundary should include both designated and non-designated heritage assets (NDHA).</p>	<p>Heritage Trust for Lincolnshire, North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council consulted on the scope of evaluation.</p> <p>As noted above, the study area used for the ES followed the Lincolnshire County Council guidance. Details of consultation held to date are included within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>Paragraph 6.4.3 of the Scoping Report 'Data sources to inform the EIA baseline characterisation' makes no reference to the Council's local list of non-designated heritage assets and its criteria for assessment. A copy of the latest list can be provided on request. In addition there is no reference to the 'made' Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan which contains schedules and descriptions of heritage assets within the Plan area. Whilst there are no Conservation Area appraisals for Blankney and Scopwick there is a high level character summary contained at Appendix 9 of the archived 2007 NKDC Local Plan which whilst prepared some time ago still serves as a source of information.</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan has informed the <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>There are 315 non-designated assets within the Site and 1km study area, these are detailed in <b>Annex 1</b>. There are also 17 buildings identified in the Scopwick and Kirkby Neighbourhood Plan retained from the 1987 Local List which are not included in the HER and two additional structures put forward in the Neighbourhood Plan for inclusion as non-designated heritage assets. This makes a total of 334 non-designated heritage assets within the 1km study area.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.4.6 of the Scoping Report notes that additional mitigation to off-set adverse impacts will take the form of a programme of archaeological investigation and recording secured by a DCO Requirement. The Council is aware that on-site geophysical survey work is anticipated to be completed by the end of April. Pending the results of those surveys the Council cannot yet agree that a programme of archaeological investigation can be deferred to a DCO Requirement, and we caution that pre-submission trial trenching will likely be required in at least some parts of the site.</p>	<p>Further non-designated heritage asset records have been provided by North Kesteven District Council. There are 127 heritage assets on the North Kesteven Local List within the 2km study area, none of these sit within the Site.</p> <p>As noted above, the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment results informed the scope of trenching, and it is considered appropriate for further trenching to be secured as a Development Consent Order Requirement as has been done for other solar farms (e.g. Mallard Pass). Further information can be found within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>Prior to commencement of the archaeological works, a programme will be agreed between the Client / Principal Contractor, Curator and Archaeological Contractor. This programme will detail proposed start and end dates for on-site works. The programme will also account for any post-excavation assessment and</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.4.8 of the Scoping Report lists the receptors/matters to be scoped into the assessment however this does not include the Conservation Areas at Scopwick, Blankney or Bloxholm. Furthermore it does not reference or confirm NDHAs to be assessed – which as above should be within 5km and should ideally include proactive identification and assessment using adopted Council guidance – see Local List of Non-Designated Heritage Assets   North Kesteven District Council (n-kesteven.gov.uk)</p>	<p>reporting, as required to discharge any archaeological requirements of the DCO.</p> <p>These Conservation Areas have been included in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>The Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has used a 2km study area for non-designated assets and 5km for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance. The local list has been included in the stage 1 setting assessment. 360 are non-designated heritage assets recorded out to 2km from the Order Limits.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.4.9 of the Scoping Report proposes to scope out setting impacts on listed dwellings within settlements over 1km from the site. We disagree with this suggestion as there is no assessment contained in the Scoping Report to support this and to justify why and how the 1km reference has been derived. The reference just to 'dwellings' rather than 'buildings' is also unclear. It is also unclear why listed K6 kiosks have been singled out for consideration.</p> <p>In the absence of detailed layout options and a plan of the HER entries applicable to the site area (those entries referred to/summarised in paragraph 6.4.9), the Council is also unable to agree to the schedule of</p>	<p>All heritage assets within 2km and all designated heritage assets within 5km have been included in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. Those sensitive to change within their setting due to their particular characteristics have been filtered for detailed assessment based on a</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>HER entries proposed to be scoped out. There is no spatial mapping of these entries contained within the Scoping Report and we will need to review this information in conjunction with Lincolnshire County Council before commenting further. The assets proposed to be scoped out of assessment at paragraph 6.4.9 are not supported by an evidence base and appear to be piecemeal and based largely on setting effects (rather than an assessment of the significance of the asset and the likely impact of the proposals) or on the type of record (for example findspots). Any proposal to 'descope' designated or relevant non-designated assets must be informed by an evidence base demonstrating the lack of direct or indirect impact upon the heritage asset and its significance.</p> <p>The Settings Assessment/Heritage Impact Assessment needs to demonstrate an understanding of the significance and context of each of those assets in order to assess the impact of the development upon them and propose any mitigation.</p> <p>In terms of archaeological considerations, detailed feedback is provided by the Council's archaeological consultant, the Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire (HTL) in the attached Appendix 2. In summary HTL comment that the proposals for construction of a solar farm will necessarily have an impact on any buried archaeological remains. Piling, building foundations, cable trenching, access roads, building compounds and construction traffic are all known impacts and the cumulative effect will be significant; therefore, trial trenching is required to establish the baseline conditions and to understand the nature and extent of the impacts on the archaeological remains.</p>	<p>worst case ZTV for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>As noted above, the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, aerial investigation and mapping and geophysical survey results informed the scope of trenching, and it is considered appropriate for further trenching to be secured as a Development Consent Order Requirement as has been done for other solar farms (e.g. Mallard Pass).</p> <p>Further information can be found within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Appendix 9.3 Aerial Investigation Report and Appendix 9.4: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b></p> <p><b>Volume 3, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> Table 9.3 presents the receptors/matters that are scoped out of the assessment together with appropriate justification.</p> <p>The term "dwellings" refers specifically to residential buildings, meaning homes where people live, rather than all types of</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>Paragraph 6.4.4 of the Scoping Report suggests that trial trenching might not be required and 6.4.6 states instead that archaeological investigation and recording could be secured by a DCO Requirement. However, HTL comment that there is currently insufficient information on the presence, character, date and significance of any archaeological deposits and that the results of the full desk-based assessment including the aerial photographic and Lidar assessments together with the results of the geophysical survey will need to inform the programme of trial trench evaluation. Mitigation through archaeological excavation may be required. Without detailed information on the archaeological potential and the likely impact of the proposals, mitigation by means of a 'watching brief' during construction is not considered acceptable as a first response. The section entitled 'Opportunities for enhancing the environment' (6.4.10) has not considered the positive and / or beneficial effects of the programme of archaeological surveys and investigations to be undertaken during this</p>	<p>buildings. For clarity, the ES distinguishes between residential and non-residential buildings throughout the assessment to ensure impacts are appropriately evaluated for each type.</p> <p>PINS agreed on Listed K6 telephone kiosks to be scoped out on the grounds that their surroundings make a neutral contribution to their significance as they are found in a variety of contexts throughout the UK. The Inspectorate agrees that significant effects on such assets are unlikely to arise.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>process and the added value that a large development can make to archaeology and cultural heritage. The programme of archaeological works should include proposals for community outreach, public engagement and dissemination of the results.</p>	<p><b>Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b></p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>We would refer the applicant to the jointly-procured detailed feedback provided by AAH on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council contained in Appendix 4, 'Technical Memorandum 1: AAH TM01'. AAH generally agree with the approach advocated for the LVIA chapter but note that the final locations of viewpoints are still to be reviewed by the applicant and will need to be agreed with LCC, NKDC and other relevant stakeholders. The final viewpoint selection should also consider views of taller and more conspicuous elements, such as battery storage or sub-stations once the layout is more developed, as well as considering potential key, or sensitive, viewpoints. The relative prematurity of the submission and the large number of variables and options in terms of site layout mean that no illustrative viewpoints have been provided at scoping stage. AAH request that photomontages are produced to illustrate the proposals at different phases namely the existing situation (baseline), Operational (year 1) and Residual with planting established (10 to 15 years). AAH also advise that the methodology should also clearly lay out the process of assessing temporary and permanent elements of the scheme, and the LVIA should clearly identify those elements that would not be decommissioned at the end of the life of the development (such as the National Grid substation), and assessed accordingly</p>	<p>Comments provided by AAH Consultants have been addressed separately above. Further consultation on the viewpoints has been undertaken with AAH Consultants (on behalf of North Kesteven District Council/Lincolnshire County Council) resulting in a letter dated 15th August 2023 confirming that the viewpoint selection was 'proportional to the project and extent of potential visual receptors.' Photomontages will be presented for a selection of these in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The number, location and type of visualisation for each viewpoint have been agreed through consultation with AAH Consultants before submission of the ES. Visualisations are prepared in accordance with the stated guidance and illustrate effects in Year 1 and Year 10.</p> <p>A detailed methodology for the LVIA is set out in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 10.1 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> and the ES have identified elements of the Proposed</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.5.2 of the Scoping Report states that based on analysis of the ZTVs (Figures 1-3) and field work undertaken to date, 'it is considered unlikely that there would be any view of the solar array or collector compounds/distributed BESS beyond 3 km of the Site boundary'. It is therefore suggested that a 3 km study area offset from the boundaries of the site is adequate and proportionate for the consideration of landscape and visual effects. The same paragraph notes that any visibility of the National Grid and Project Substation would be limited to a maximum distance of 5 km from the site.</p> <p>We note though that, whilst each case must be assessed on its merits relevant to the surrounding topography, a 5km study area for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) was proposed in relation to the Heckington Fen solar farm and where in that case the maximum height of built infrastructure was markedly lower than the National Grid and Project Substation proposed at Springwell.</p> <p>AAH comment that at this early stage, the proposed study area extents should be discussed and further reviewed as the full extent of potential visibility of the development is not yet fully known, and the ZTV mapping contained within Appendix F of the Scoping Report does identify potential visibility beyond these extents. The ZTV mapping would need to be updated once the proposals have developed (as stated within paragraph</p>	<p>Development which would not be decommissioned at the end of the operational period.</p> <p>Details of consultation held to date are included within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The study area has been discussed through further consultation and on 15th August 2023 AAH Consultants (on behalf of North Kesteven District Council/Lincolnshire County Council) confirmed that 'The proposed 3km study area is appropriate from the solar PV development and 5km from the National Grid and Project Substation and National Grid connecting towers. However, the LVIA within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, should clearly state the justification for these study areas, and thoroughly assess and confirm no significant views are available from beyond the study area. Also, as it is not confirmed as to whether the National Grid Substation and National Grid connecting towers are to be included within the redline boundary, and if so both the final location and design</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>13.5) and the study area should not be fixed until the full extents of visibility are known from both desktop and site work. It therefore seems appropriate to assume a (minimum – TBA) 5km study area across the scheme rather than a reduction to 3km for the solar array or collector compounds/distributed BESS.</p> <p>The data sources and policy considerations referred to in paragraph 6.5.3 should be revised to the 2023 adopted CLLP and where Appendices B and D in particular of the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan 2021 – 2036 should be referred to alongside the Design Code by way of considering any impacts on key views and green gaps.</p>	<p>of these elements, and the Project Substation, is yet to be confirmed, therefore while every effort has been made to accommodate this with the viewpoint selection, additional viewpoints and extension of the 5km study area may be required subject to confirmation of these aspects.'</p> <p>The National Grid Substation and connecting towers no longer form part of the Proposed Development. The ZTVs demonstrate that in the worst case scenario there would be negligible visibility of the Proposed Development beyond the study area proposed above. Any landscape or visual effects beyond this distance would not be significant. The above study area has been reviewed prior to submission.</p> <p>Updates to policy documents have been noted.</p> <p>Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.5.5 of the Scoping Report states that 'There are no tourist attractions or recognised viewpoints from which the Proposed</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> identifies</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>Development may be visible', however these attractions and viewpoints are seemingly not defined or mapped.</p> <p>The 'decommissioning' references in paragraph 6.5.6 do not refer to the retention of the NGS and associated infrastructure as permanent development, and the degree to which additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation will be formulated to reflect this.</p>	<p>all relevant visual receptors in the study area.</p> <p>The ES clearly identifies any elements of the Proposed Development which would not be decommissioned at the end of the operational period.</p> <p>National Grid Substation no longer forms part of the Proposed Development</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Sections 6.5.8 and 6.5.9 of the Scoping Report identify a range of potential visual receptors to be scoped in or out of the LVIA, however at this early stage of the project we request these be reviewed and consulted upon further once proposals have been developed and we are not in a position to confirm their inclusion or omission. It is assumed that the reference at paragraph 6.5.8 to 'Residents of the barracks at RAF Digby' means all MOD residential property.</p> <p>As above, on the basis that no further information has been provided to date to justify that significant landscape and visual effects arising from the solar array/collector compounds/distributed BESS and NGS/PS would be limited to 1km and 3km respectively, we cannot yet agree that assessments of impacts on users of the PRowS/local road network and residential properties should be restricted to those distances.</p> <p>In addition it is not clear how the applicant will define a developed footprint or settlement curtilage by way of assessing impacts on residents and visitors to the villages of Scopwick, Kirkby Green, Blankney and Ashby De La Launde vs 'isolated' properties. As a minimum maps 2a and 2b contained in the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan should</p>	<p>The scope of the LVIA and the receptors/matters to be scoped in and out of the assessment are reviewed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>All residents (including all MOD residential property) are considered in the LVIA where relevant.</p> <p>Refer to the response above regarding the LVIA study area.</p> <p>Hard boundaries around settlements are not defined – for the avoidance of doubt all residential receptors are considered in the LVIA where relevant.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>be used however the Council would wish to agree the study area for all named settlements including Blankney and Ashby De La Launde.</p> <p>In terms of residential visual amenity, paragraph 6.5.11 quotes from Technical Guidance Note 02 / 19 'Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) and states that the LVIA will present, as an appendix to the main assessment, a residential amenity assessment of visual effects on residential properties for any property where there is a possibility that the visual effects may approach the 'public interest' (harm) threshold referred to in the guidance.</p> <p>The RVAA should not focus solely on individual or groups of properties however should consider the magnitude of change to residential amenity on a 'settlement scale' basis taking account not only of fixed address points but also the experiences of residents of those settlements when travelling into and around those areas. This is notwithstanding that the 2019 RVAA guidance (paragraph 4.8) states that 'Properties are normally assessed individually, but if their outlook and / or views are in all aspects the same (for example if a development is visible from the rear gardens only of a small row of houses) they could be assessed as one (group)'. This is particularly relevant to Scopwick, Kirkby Green and Ashby de la Launde where the suggested site area/Order Limits overlap with most of the roads and rights of way passing into and through those settlements meaning that (depending on buffer zones and detailed layouts) there may be limited visual relief and separation from extensive unbroken arrays of panels, experienced on a 'day to day' basis and a potentially overbearing or overwhelming residential amenity impact felt across the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>The absence of any detailed layouts prevents further feedback at this stage and we therefore wish to agree the scope of the assessment further.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.8 of the 2019 RVAA guidance states that 'Judgements formed in respect of Residential Visual Amenity should not be confused with the</p>	<p>RVAA as defined in Technical Guidance Note 02 / 19 'Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) is concerned with the circumstances of individual (or groups) of residential properties. However as noted above and for the avoidance of doubt all residential receptors are considered in the LVIA where relevant. For those properties included in the RVAA, the visual effects on the access/egress from the property is part of the consideration of overall visual amenity.</p> <p>The RVAA is presented in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.5 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>judgement regarding Residential Amenity because the latter is a planning matter'.</p> <p>The 2019 guidance focusses generally on 'living conditions' associated with views and impacts from fixed points/addresses. In addition paragraph 4.14 recommends describing and evaluating the predicted magnitude of visual change and related visual amenity effects for properties, rather than potentially settlement-wide 'experiential' residential impacts for residents who, whilst individually may not experience significant adverse affects associated with outlooks or changes of view from their property may be unable to disconnect with a sense of potential 'enclosure' by development in and around where they live, work or spent recreational time.</p> <p>Strict adherence to 2019 RVAA guidance to the detriment of residential amenity (as opposed to residential visual amenity) may therefore not be appropriate in this case.</p>	
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>Appendix 3 contains advice from the Council's agricultural consultant, Landscape. Paragraph 6.6.4 of the Scoping Report confirms that whilst a walkover survey of the site and surrounding area has been undertaken as part of the baseline assessment (20 - 21 October 2022), an Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey has not yet been concluded as is underway to provide confirmation of ALC across all areas of the site.</p>	<p>The outputs of the Agricultural Land Classification survey are detailed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, with supporting ALC reports provided as appendices in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 11.1A: Springwell Central Agricultural Land Classification, Appendix 11.1B: Springwell East, Lincolnshire Agricultural Land Classification, and Appendix 11.1C: Springwell West, Lincolnshire Agricultural Land Classification [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>Paragraph 3.10.14 of the March 2023 consultation draft 'National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)' states that 'Where</p>	<p>Agricultural land classification survey has been undertaken to inform the ES.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary, poorer quality land should be preferred to higher quality land (avoiding the use of “Best and Most Versatile” agricultural land where possible)’. The confirmation that ALC surveying is still underway across the site reinforces the Council’s concerns regarding the prematurity of this scoping submission and the failure to align layout options (including the more permanent or semi-permanent infrastructure elements) to maximise the use of non-BMV land.</p> <p>The ALC survey has been commenced without reference to or agreement with the Council (in terms of its scope) and as such we reserve the right to request additional augering or analysis depending on the results presented in due course. We note that the percentages of BMV land across the site calculated to date using the National Level Data show that 32.8% of the Site is Grade 2 land (497Ha) and 67.2% of the Site is classified as Grade 3 land (1,020Ha). It is therefore probable that a further substantial hectareage is comprised of Grade 3a ‘good’ quality agricultural land pending the outcome of the ALC survey. The report notes that the Natural England ‘Technical Information Note TIN049: Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile land, 2nd edition (2012)’ will be used for the purposes of assessment, and mindful that ALC survey is underway without prior consultation with the Council we would highlight that TIN049 recommends a frequency of one boring per hectare for a detailed assessment. It is also important that the ALC survey is undertaken in line with the MAFF 1988 guidelines.</p> <p>Without prejudice, and mindful that the National Level Data mapping envisages a composition of Grade 2 and 3 land only, the Council considers that any information presented in the ALC assessment would not be representative if undertaken below the augering frequency suggested in Technical Advice note 49.</p>	<p>Further detail on Agricultural Land Classification survey methodology and results is provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. Further information on the alternatives in relation to BMV land is provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The design has included embedded mitigation to reduce the impact of loss of high quality agricultural land. The design of the Proposed Development has minimised the use of higher grade agricultural land within the Order Limits, where practicable. Reasonable alternatives considered are provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. All fields comprising solely of Grade 1 or 2 land within the site will remain in arable production. Several fields within the Order Limits will be required for installation of cabling, but will be returned to agricultural use after the cable has been laid (<b>ES Volume 2, Figure 3.1: Zonal Masterplan [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>).</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>According to available published data and local knowledge, the soils locally are mainly Marcham 343e and Aswarby 512a Soil Associations. Both of these soils are limestone based, with shallow well drained loamy soils, over limestone and deeper brown earths. Occasionally there are heavier clay soils present of the Curdridge 841a Association.</p> <p>Previous ALC surveys locally on these soils and similar have indicated a mixture of Grades 2, 3a and 3b land. It is likely that the shallower soils will be 3b, whilst deeper soils will be 3a or Grade 2, even with some areas of Grade 1. The ALC should identify where BMV land is and the scheme should seek to protect and minimise damage to higher grade land wherever possible in line with national planning policy.</p> <p>Without prejudice to the ALC survey the Council's view is that there is undoubtedly a large proportion of BMV land in this vicinity and only a full ALC will identify where it is and what the Grade and quality is. Laboratory analysis of representative samples should be used to determine textures. Either the 'Land, Soils and Groundwater' or the 'Ecology and Biodiversity' chapter of the ES should also consider the interplay between agricultural and ecological/BNG impacts – and therefore the degree to which effects are temporary/reversible. There is evidence that organic matter builds up in biodiversity areas at a faster rate than arable farmland and this may benefit the land, but it is not a factor in the assessment of ALC. Long term, where biodiverse land becomes ecologically important there is the possibility of land becoming assigned with environmental designations, such as SSSI status, though generally this has not so far occurred on other solar sites. If land remains uncultivated for longer than five years, then permission may be required from Natural England to bring the land back into arable cultivation.</p> <p>Any material enhancement in the botanical diversity of the sward (to the extent that the application site may then considered to be of ecological value), will limit the capacity for the land to be returned to arable use after</p>	

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>the solar farm has been decommissioned. The EIA (Agriculture) (England) (No.2) Regulations 2006 prohibit the physical or chemical cultivation of what are considered to be 'semi-natural areas'. 'Cultivation' is not clearly defined and does not necessarily require land to have been ploughed and therefore there is a possibility that areas of environmentally 'enhanced' land within the site may not be permitted to return to arable farmland after the 40 year period.</p> <p>The 'alternatives' exercise also needs to consider alternative site layouts and potentially a reduction in MW generating capacity aligned with location of the respective ALC Grades once the report has been analysed, in order to demonstrate avoidance or minimisation of agricultural land impacts as recommended in paragraph 3.10.14 of the March 2023 draft EN3.</p>	
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.6.6 of the Scoping Report makes no reference to the avoidance of BMV land in the scheme's approach to additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation. This is in conflict with the above draft EN-3 document. Paragraph 6.6.7 'description of likely significant effects' simply sets out that it is 'anticipated that there will be a reduction in the availability of BMV land' without any commitment to minimise or avoid those effects through ongoing review of the scheme layout. The same paragraph suggests that the majority of the land use will be short-term and temporary, some will be long-term but temporary (construction and operation) and some will be permanent (for example the National Grid substation). Mindful that the NGS is likely to be permanent operational development that is not decommissioned at/ahead of the 40-year lifetime of the solar park, the Council considers it likely that this will increase the prospect and probability that the solar park would seek repowering or partial repowering beyond 40 years. Whilst we appreciate that such a scheme is not before PINS and they are required to consider the Scoping Report as submitted we would request that this potential scenario is accounted for not least with</p>	<p>The design has included embedded mitigation to avoid the loss of high quality agricultural land. Detailed in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has minimised the use of higher grade agricultural land, where practicable. Reasonable alternatives considered are provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>All fields comprising solely of Grade 1 or 2 land within the site will remain in arable production.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>reference to whether any residual BMV impacts are able to be classed as temporary/reversible. There is no reference in the Scoping Report as to whether and how agricultural land use continuance across the site is to be delivered alongside the operation of the solar farm. This should be addressed in the ES chapter and should include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Acknowledging the proposed change from primarily arable farming to solar</li> <li>➤ Whether any pastoral farming (for example sheep grazing) is proposed within the site, and if so where and how this is to be secured. This should include;                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identifying whether contracts are in place for pastoral farming;</li> <li>• whether those contracts span the operational duration of the scheme (40 years minimum); and</li> <li>• whether and how the applicant considers that such contractual obligations, and more broadly, a change from one type of agricultural activity (pre-development) to another (post-development) could be legally secured, monitored and enforced through the DCO regime – for example through the use of Requirements/legal agreement</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ For all other areas within the site whether or how those areas will remain in agricultural activity with the presence of solar panels and BNG habitat/landscaping implementation</li> </ul> <p>In order to satisfy Schedule 4 (7) of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 the applicant must be able to identify and arguably secure any measures relied upon to avoid, prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset any identified significant adverse effects; not least where this is partly relied upon by any proposed change in agricultural activity across the site.</p> <p>As a general observation, this part of Lincolnshire/North Kesteven District is a mainly arable farming area with only limited sheep grazing operations.</p>	<p>Several fields within the Order Limits will be required for installation of cabling, but will be returned to agricultural use after the cable has been laid (<b>ES Volume 2, Figure 3.1: Zonal Masterplan [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>).</p> <p>Further detail is included in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Noted in relation to the structure of the <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b>.</p> <p>National Grid Substation no longer forms part of the Proposed Development.</p>

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

Whilst it is possible to graze the areas under and between the panels, it is unlikely to be very cost effective for a grazier. The difficulties of rounding up sheep and handling them, together with finding sick or wounded animals makes the grazier's workload harder and more complex. As such the economics of moving sheep to and from the site will be marginal. Grass does not tend to grow well under the panels themselves and there are often areas that are dry and barren or that only host weed species, due to heavy shading.

Grazing management is also not easily compatible with standard biodiversity management practices at Solar Photovoltaic sites due to fundamental population biology principles. As the site is in arable production at present, currently it may have a relatively low level of biodiversity (although see the comments submitted by AECOM in Appendix 1). The grazing management plan may, therefore, lead to a modest increase in species richness at the site from current base levels, but it will not deliver the level of biodiversity that the site could potentially achieve if biodiversity gains were prioritised over agricultural production.

By grazing land for agricultural livestock production, the level of disturbance is high. This prevents plant species with a slow establishment rate (which often are those which are ultimately strong competitors) from growing – and thus the invertebrates that feed on these species are also excluded from the area. Areas which promote high species diversity often use low intensity grazing as a means to promoting biodiversity.

Grazing represents a form of disturbance to the area, thus preventing any one species becoming too dominant. It also helps manage the sward to provide an optimum habitat for invertebrates.

Stock densities are generally monitored and adjusted to prevent either under and overgrazing and to ensure the sward contains a mix of long and short vegetation with some plants in flower. There is therefore some conflict between maintaining the land in agricultural production and

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>improving biodiversity. Whilst not incompatible, site based issues, such as soil type(s) and local agricultural practices may therefore pose conflicts which the relevant ES chapter/s should assess.</p> <p>Landscape also advise that the ES contains a farm holdings impact statement with reference to the farm holdings affected by the proposal and which addresses viability, infrastructure and long term consequences on the individual holding. Finally, Landscape note that paragraph 2.6.9 commits to submitting an Outline Soils Management Plan (oSMP) with the DCO Application and they recommend that the oSMP is structured to include the headings contained in their Appendix 3 advice, not least to address soil structural issues and waterlogging that has occurred on solar farms elsewhere in the UK.</p>	
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>With reference to paragraph 6.6.8 of the Scoping Report we would recommend seeking the advice of the defence consultees regarding the possible need to scope in the potential for UXO around RAF Digby.</p>	<p>The Applicant has amended the scheme in response to MOD specific requests for amendments within the technical safeguarding zone, by removing Solar PV from fields directly to the south of RAF Digby.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.6.9 of the Scoping Report suggests that impacts on the Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) could be scoped out through consultation with Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) to ensure that any negative implications for the MSA is minimised. Our view is that it would be premature to scope this issue out at this stage however we would defer to Planning Inspectorate and LCC assessment.</p> <p>The development design and layout in part relies upon and needs to be informed by the findings of the Minerals Assessment and on the basis of the Appendix B zonal masterplan there is significant uncertainty as to where and whether buffer or safeguarding zones around quarries have been considered; to include Longwood and Brauncewell Quarries.</p>	<p>A Mineral Safeguarding Assessment is within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b> submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application. Consultation was held with LCC with regard to the scope of the Minerals.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>With reference to paragraph 6.7.4 of the Scoping Report, the Planning Inspectorate are advised that the baseline approach adopted at Heckington Fen included reference to Professional Practice Guidance on Planning and Noise (ProPG, Association of Noise Consultants, Institute of Acoustics, Chartered Institute of Environmental Health, 2017)', BS 5228 Parts 1 and 2 (British Standard Institute, 2009, amended 2014) and BS 4142 (British Standard Institute, 2014 amended 2019). The same paragraph notes that monitoring will be undertaken in the form of long-term noise measurements, typically of 1-week duration, in order to quantify the existing noise environment and sources of noise impacting the assessment receptors and would encompass continuous periods throughout daytime and night, accounting for the likely operational times of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Council wishes to agree both the location and timing of background noise monitoring locations to take account of issues such as the seasonality of land use (harvest), traffic peaks/school holidays (road traffic noise) and whether there are any concentrations of airspace use for example by RAF Waddington, Cranwell and Coningsby. The applicant has recognised mineral extraction activity from Brauncewell Quarry (off A15) and Longwood Quarry (off Long Wood Lane) however should check with those operators whether there are any peaks or patterns of quarrying activity which might also influence baseline noise assessment.</p>	<p>Noise baseline methodology was agreed with North Kesteven District Council in advance of the survey work. Further detail is included in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.7.7 of the Scoping Report does not refer to any noise associated with possible use of tracking panels. This option has not yet been ruled out and therefore the noise chapter of the ES needs to consider operational noise associated with motors, plant and equipment associated with the pivoting and rotation of panels. Cumulative noise impacts may then need to be assessed stemming from the creation of variable</p>	<p>Tracker panels have since been discounted from the Proposed Development and therefore have not been assessed within the ES.</p> <p>The Proposed Development will not have borrow pits.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>'corridors' down which noise could pass depending on the alignment of panels at different times of the day.                      This should also account for the operational noise generated by substations, inverters and other noise-emitting plant and equipment relative to those corridors and the off-site sensitive receptor locations. In addition the paragraph doesn't specifically refer to noise associated with borrow pits although this is inferred through reference to earthmoving.                      The 'Decommissioning Assessment' section of paragraph 6.7.11 doesn't refer to the permanent retention of the NGSS.</p>	<p>The National Grid Navenby Substation does not form part of the Proposed Development</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.8.4 of the Scoping Report suggests referencing relevant DfT traffic count data for the B1188, B1189, B1191 and A15 links with regard to construction traffic routeing to each respective access. Solar panels and components will potentially arrive via east coast ports and therefore the ES should also factor in construction vehicle impacts along the A17 corridor unless otherwise scoped out in consultation with the Highway Authority. This should include cumulative construction (and where relevant operational) effects associated with Triton Knoll, Viking Link, Heckington Fen solar (including works to Bicker Fen Substation), Beacon Fen solar, Temple Oaks solar and the Lincolnshire Reservoir depending on the timeframes of those projects. TCPA (1990) projects requiring cumulative assessment of transport effects include the Sleaford West and potentially the Sleaford South SUEs (A17/A15 corridor), along with the Lincoln South East Quadrant (SEQ) SUE which sits alongside parts of the A15 and B1188.                      We agree that operational transport impacts can be scoped out of the ES as noted in paragraph 6.8.9.                      There is an extensive network of public rights of way (PRoW) within the site which link with the surrounding settlements. Opportunities to create new and expanded routes that would improve access and links between</p>	<p>Traffic and Transport matters are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport [EN010149/APP/6.1], ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> and the <b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.8]</b>.</p> <p>Usage of the B1188, B1191, and A15 for construction traffic use was identified and therefore these were included to the study area. After discussions with Lincolnshire County Council it was agreed for the exclusion of the B1189 and the inclusion of the B1202 in the ongoing assessments relating to construction traffic to those links discussed during scoping.                      An assessment has been undertaken of the inter-project and intra-project</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>settlements should be considered with potential additional public footpaths and bridleways created as part of the development.</p> <p>Any such routes should not utilise routes used for construction or maintenance activities and be a minimum width of 4m for public footpaths and 5m for public bridleways. Any fencing alongside a public path should be open mesh construction and not close board timber fencing or metal palisade to avoid the creation of a narrow claustrophobic environment.</p> <p>Any new routes to be created should look to be formally adopted as part of the Definitive Rights of Way network rather than permissive routes which could potentially be removed at any point during the life of the project. If permissive routes are proposed then details should be provided of the mechanisms to be adopted to ensure these remain in place for the duration and life of the development.</p> <p>The applicant should also investigate the potential to deliver/accommodate the elements of the Scopwick/Kirkby Green to Metheringham Railway Station Community Projects detailed in Appendix A of the SKGNP where these are located within the DCO boundary.</p>	<p>cumulative effects, related to each environmental factor which is detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. This chapter sets out the methodology for carrying out the assessment, the Zone of Influence for each environmental factor that has been assessed, the short list of other developments assessed, mitigation and the likely inter and intra-project cumulative effects. No significant inter-project cumulative effects have been identified in the assessment</p> <p>Consideration of elements of the Appendix A of the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan is undertaken across the project, including enhancement of the Spires and Steeples Trail improving access in a north south alignment for non-motorised user travel towards Metheringham as outlined in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and masterplan.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Paragraphs 7.1.16 and 7.1.17 of the Scoping Report state that in order to be taken forward for cumulative effects consideration, NSIP or DNS development, transport infrastructure developments, approved energy infrastructure developments and other forms of development must lie within</p>	<p>An assessment has been undertaken of the inter-project and intra-project cumulative effects, related to each environmental factor which is detailed in</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>the Zone of Influence of the Proposed Development. The Zol is then defined as the study area for each environmental factor considered in the EIA for the Proposed Development and that the environmental factor-specific study areas, and appropriate justifications for these study areas, will be provided in the ES. The Scoping Report states that the search area for forming the long list of other existing development and/or approved developments will be based on the greatest Zol in terms of distance. This approach is not accepted by cross reference to a number of the Zols expressed elsewhere in the Scoping Report. For the avoidance of doubt the Council suggests that cumulative effects associated with BMV agricultural land impacts (i.e. in relation to 'Land, soils and groundwater') should as a minimum include all of the NSIP solar projects in Lincolnshire at Heckington Fen, Beacon Fen, Tillbridge Solar, Temple Oaks, Cottam, West Burton, Gate Burton and Mallard Pass along with BMV agricultural land impacts associated with the Lincolnshire Reservoir. We reserve the right to highlight other projects as and when these become known and can advise how these might be treated with reference to Table 2 of Advice Note Seventeen 'Cumulative effects assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects'. Depending on the LVIA ZTVs associated with the projects located within the North Kesteven District there are not anticipated to be any cumulative LVIA impacts however some cumulative transport impacts associated with construction phases might occur across the North Kesteven and South Kesteven/Rutland solar NSIP schemes depending on respective project timescales and construction traffic routing</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1].</b> This chapter sets out the methodology for carrying out the assessment, the Zone of Influence for each environmental factor that has been assessed, the short list of other developments assessed, mitigation and the likely inter and intra-project cumulative effects. No significant inter-project cumulative effects have been identified in the assessment                      This is based on further consultation with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council that was conducted to agree the final short list for inclusion in the ES.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>The ES should be prepared with reference to the 2023 Central Lincolnshire Local Plan which was adopted on 13th April 2023, rather than the 2017 CLLP which has now been replaced. The applicant is also advised that the proposed DCO boundary includes the allocated residential development site 'Land North of Heath Road, Scopwick' subject to Policy 12a of the</p>	<p>The ES has been prepared in reference to the 2023 Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>SKGNP which is identified for the development of around 14 dwellings. The DCO boundary should therefore exclude this site and on a precautionary basis will need to assume development within the SKGNP Plan period in terms of sensitive receptor locations and baseline assessment where relevant to the specific ES chapters.</p>	<p>North Kesteven District Council has been consulted throughout the duration of the design of the Proposed Development.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>In addition as set out above the revised draft NPS EN-3 expressly considers Solar Photovoltaic Generation (page 82 onwards) and is subject to a period of consultation ending on 25 May 2023. Consequently depending on the point at which the DCO is applied for, and during consideration of the application, either s104 or s105 of the Act will be engaged. Even if still in draft, the March 2023 consultation versions of EN-1 and EN-3 will be a material consideration</p>	<p>Noted. This is presented within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b> submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Finally we would reiterate that this Scoping Report, dated 21 March 2023, was submitted only 2 weeks following the end of the non-statutory consultation process and our position is that this significantly compresses and restricts the opportunity for the applicant to have meaningfully considered, reflected upon, and addressed representations made during this initial non-statutory consultation and to account for how those representations have informed the scale, layout and composition of the scheme.</p> <p>On that basis our view is that this submission does not comply with the guidance set out in Advice Note Seven 'Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements'. We are concerned that the timescales adopted unilaterally by the applicant – culminating in this Reg. 10 and 11 Scoping Opinion request to the Planning Inspectorate - has undermined the degree to which the information contained in the Scoping Report could be relied upon as a robust representation of the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed development.</p>	<p>The length of the consultation period was sufficient to enable consultees to understand the Proposed Development and share their feedback.</p> <p>The Applicant 30% conducted its Phase One Consultation on the Proposed Development for six weeks (42 days) between 24 January 2023 and 7 March 2023. This is 14 days more than the 28-day statutory minimum prescribed in section 45 of the PA 2008 and Regulation 4(3)(i) of the AFFF Regulations. In addition, the Applicant publicised the launch of the consultation from 10 January 2023 (two weeks ahead of the start of consultation) to give people sufficient notice of the consultation period, including</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p>the times and dates of the public events and the deadline for providing feedback.</p>		
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>		
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Do you agree with the proposed list of consultees? I consider the identified list of ecology consultees to be appropriate. The consultation with Natural England will support the conclusions in relation to potential impacts on statutory sites and requirements for Habitats Regulations Assessment</p>	<p>Natural England has been consulted. Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Do you agree with the proposed study areas? I am in general agreement with the study areas. However, I would query (given the very limited information provided) the restriction of badger surveys to the site only given the potential for impacts on habitat accessibility and commuting routes, and consequently inter-relationships between badger clans. The study areas for national and international designations should also consider the Impact Risk Zones identified by Natural England, rather than relying solely on fixed search distances.</p>	<p>Badger surveys have covered the area within the Order Limits and the wider area (as the area within the red line boundary has since been significantly reduced). Only one small main sett and associated outlier setts have been identified on Site and the setts do not show evidence of high usage. Pre-construction badger surveys will be carried out. The impacts on badgers will be considered in the design with 30m buffers from known setts.</p> <p>The south-western edge of Springwell west is within an SSSI Impact Risk Zone for High Dyke SSSI (3.6km SW of the Site). The Proposed Development is not considered likely to impact the SSSI, as the type of developments of concern are for air pollution, which are listed as: aviation, livestock and poultry units, slurry</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		lagoons and digestate stores and manure stores.
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	Do you agree that the data sources listed to inform the EIA baseline characterisation are appropriate? I agree with the data sources identified	Noted.
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	Do you agree that the surveys proposed to inform the EIA baseline characterisation are appropriate? I agree these are generally appropriate, but there are omissions. There is no specific mention of flora, but the arable landscape could support a number of scarce arable plant species of conservation concern and dependent on maintenance of cultivation regimes. As identified above there is a need for further clarity on the approach for badger. Similarly, insufficient information has been provided to agree that wintering birds can be scoped out. It is also not clear what approach is being taken in relation to the Schedule 1 bird species that could occur in the zone of influence	<p>North Kesteven District Council has been consulted with and the scope of surveys has been agreed. Notable arable plant and wintering bird surveys have been undertaken to inform <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The approach to avoid impact to Schedule 1 bird species, including barn owl, has been included in the ES assessment. See above for badger.</p>
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	Are any receptors/assets/resources not identified that you would like to see included in the EIA? See response to the above question. The information submitted with the Scoping Report is not sufficient to allow me to agree with the scoping assessment provided in Section 6.2.9. Supplementary information will be expected at PEIR stage.	<p>The scope of surveys and receptors have been discussed and agreed with the NKDC ecologist, as discussed above. Details of surveys and receptors are provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, and <b>ES Volume 3, Appendices 7.2-7.14 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	Do you agree with the proposed additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation measures and is this mitigation appropriate? The identified measures seem reasonable as a starting point. It is not possible to provide a formal response to this question given the very limited information	<p>Information on consultation, embedded design and mitigation measures is detailed within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>provided. No reports were provided for the surveys completed in 2022. I defer further advice on this until the PEIR stage, which I anticipate will provide more comprehensive and detailed information on the work completed, the constraints identified, and potential impact pathways</p>	
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Do you agree with the receptors/matters that are proposed to be scoped in and out of the EIA? With certain exceptions, insufficient information has been provided to transparently explain, and therefore support and agree, the scoping of relevant ecological receptors. Further information will be required at the PEIR stage.</p>	<p>The scope of surveys and receptors have been discussed and agreed with the NKDC ecologist, as discussed above . Details of engagement undertaken, surveys and receptors are provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1], ES Volume 3, Appendices 7.2-7.14 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Do you agree with the proposed factor-specific assessment approach? The impact assessment approach based on standard good practice CIEEM methods is acceptable. The applicant should confirm that the current iteration of this guidance has been utilised. This is dated 2022, not 2018 as stated. A biodiversity net gain (BNG) assessment should be provided to demonstrate no net loss of, and a minimum 10% net gain in, biodiversity in accordance with local planning policy and to ensure consistency with other recent solar farm applications in the district. The current iteration of the good practice method is Biodiversity Metric 4.0.</p>	<p>The biodiversity net gain assessment (using Biodiversity Metric 4.0) will be submitted as part of <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 7.15: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment is based on the latest CIEEM good practice guidance dated 2016.</p> <p>The Statutory Metric was used to calculate Biodiversity Net Gain from habitat creation and enhancement proposals. The Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan is</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>I agree that the prevailing land use (intensive arable production) limits the scope for potential ecological impacts and offers good opportunities for biodiversity enhancement.</p> <p>The identified Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) of relevance are consistent with the sites identified in the online Local Plan Policies Map ('Aurora'). As the reasons for designation have not been defined in the Scoping Report it is not possible at present to agree that LWS can be screened out or that the proposed mitigation (including stand-off distances) is sufficient.</p> <p>The screening for statutory designation is likely correct but consideration should be given to the Impact Risk Zones defined by Natural England</p>	<p>detailed and secured in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> and has been mindful of the monitoring requirements of BNG.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>The Scoping Report states (in Section 2.3.19) that there are no ancient woodlands (an irreplaceable habitat) in the zone of influence. This is not certain, and instead the conclusion should be (given the desk based resources utilised and the limitations of these) that there are no recorded ancient woodlands in the area. The Ancient Woodland Inventory is not</p>	<p>The details of LWS designations are presented in the PEA reports. Four LWSs have now been scoped in since updated design will require vegetation clearance of sections of these LWS grass verges for highways access. The approach for impact assessment of LWSs and mitigation is included in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>There are no internationally designated statutory nature conservation sites within 10km and no nationally designated nature conservation sites within 2km. As stated above, the Site is within the IRZ of High Dyke SSSI however the Proposed Development is not considered likely to impact the SSSI.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>The Scoping Report states (in Section 2.3.19) that there are no ancient woodlands (an irreplaceable habitat) in the zone of influence. This is not certain, and instead the conclusion should be (given the desk based resources utilised and the limitations of these) that there are no recorded ancient woodlands in the area. The Ancient Woodland Inventory is not</p>	<p>Potential impacts on all woodlands in the zone of influence have been considered. There are no woodlands within the Order Limits. All woodlands adjacent to the Site will be protected from built development by</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>definitive and generally omits woodlands smaller than 2ha. Therefore, the applicant should ensure that all woodlands in the zone of influence have been suitably assessed to demonstrate the absence of potential ancient woodland. Formal consultation with Natural England would be required if potential ancient woodlands are identified. In the absence of this, potential ancient woodlands should be protected in accordance with current Standing Advice1.</p>	<p>standard 15m works buffer zones. Mitigation measures will be detailed in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN101049/APP/7.7]</b>, <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> and the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>I found no information on veteran and ancient trees (irreplaceable habitat) in the Scoping Report. These could occur in areas of woodland, as free standing trees or in hedgerows. The presence/ absence of veteran and ancient trees should be clarified at PEIR stage. If present, such trees should be protected in accordance with current Standing Advice2.</p>	<p>One veteran tree has been identified in a hedgerow within the Order Limits. This lies in an area for habitat creation and/or improvement and is at least 250m from any proposed built development. There will be a standard 10m buffer from field boundaries. Consideration will be given to the veteran tree which may require a larger buffer depending on their size. Mitigation measures will be detailed in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN101049/APP/7.7]</b>, <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> and the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>The Scoping Report omits information on Green Infrastructure, which encompasses land identified as Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs). The online Local Plan Policies Map identifies BOAs in all three component</p>	<p>Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) will be considered in <b>ES Volume 3, BNG Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>parts of the proposed solar farm. BOAs are covered by specific planning policy (within both the current and emerging local plans) and have relevance to BNG assessment. Appendix 4 of the emerging local plan identifies the principles for development with BOAs. This should be considered and addressed by the Applicant. Further information in relation to this should be provided at PEIR stage.</p>	
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>The Scoping Report identifies the presence of priority hedgerows within the site. Further information should be provided on the approach taken to identifying these. I assume that Hedgerow Regulations methods have been employed to collect structured data on hedgerows, and to identify any 'important' hedgerows. I would encourage this approach and would emphasise that all Hedgerow Regulations criteria should be addressed. These include heritage, landscape and wildlife criteria.</p>	<p>Hedgerow surveys have been carried out, taking in consideration the Hedgerow Regulations– which includes identification of any ecologically Important Hedgerows.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>The Scoping Report identifies the presence of a number of priority habitats. These are priorities at the national level, as well as in terms of (as stated in Section 6.2.5) the Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plan. The Scoping Report identifies a suite of notable bird species of cultivated and farmed land. These bird species are likely to be affected by changes in land use and management arising from the Proposed Development. This will be a relevant consideration to address in the impact assessment and when developing the mitigation and habitat compensation strategy. In support of this, the applicant should refer to the relevant Standing Advice<sup>3</sup></p>	<p>Ground nesting birds are scoped in. Assessment and mitigation is detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>My understanding of the site and the approach to scoping is constrained by the lack of reports for the surveys completed in 2022, including the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) report. The latter would have been a beneficial supplement to the Scoping Report. In most cases, the summary survey scope (Section 6.2.4) does not identify the methods to be applied or the survey timings. As a consequence, there</p>	<p>Details on survey methods are presented in the PEA, botany and protected reports (shown in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Volume 3, Appendices 7.2-7.14 [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>). Condition</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>is insufficient information to allow me to confirm that the survey work completed to date is appropriate and sufficient. This will need to be reviewed and agreed at PEIR stage. The approach to habitat survey does not include mention of specific requirements for BNG assessment i.e. Site Condition Assessment. The current best practice method for this is set out in the guidance for Biodiversity Metric 4.04. A MoRPH assessment is likely to be required to calculate baseline river units if watercourses (with the exception of ditches) are present in or adjacent to the red line boundary. Further information is needed on the approach to hedgerow survey. As stated above, a comprehensive Hedgerow Regulations assessment is encouraged. Similarly, further information is needed on the approach to veteran and ancient tree survey.</p>	<p>assessment will follow Biodiversity Metric 4.04 or latest version.</p> <p>See response above regarding hedgerow survey and the single veteran tree which has been identified on Site. There are several small watercourse ditches within the Order Limits and due to their size, a MoRPH assessment has not been undertaken. However, for the purposes of assessment they have been assessed as moderate condition on a precautionary basis within the BNG assessment.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>The survey approach for badger needs to deliver data suitable to assess the relevant impacts and to meet requirements of Standing Advice5. This includes considerations around access to foraging and watering areas, habitat connectivity (given badgers can be faithful to specific movement routes), and implications for territorial boundaries (e.g. from the erection of an extensive network of security fencing). Given the absence of detailed survey information and an understanding of main sett locations, I am not certain that surveys should be restricted to the site boundary. This should be clarified further at PEIR stage.</p>	<p>See above regarding badgers (including access across the site).</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Reptile survey will be needed if the habitats of relevance cannot be avoided as indicated.</p>	<p>The area suitable for reptiles has been avoided.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	The great crested newt survey scope does not confirm that the off-site ponds located within 500m of the proposed development have been surveyed for this species. This should be confirmed at PEIR stage.	Great crested newt are considered likely absent from the Order Limits. All suitable ponds within 500m of the Order Limits tested negative for great crested newt eDNA (although two ponds were 'indeterminate', they were also considered likely negative due to their close proximity to other ponds which tested negative). Details of the surveys are provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Appendix 7.1: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> .
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	No specific mention is given to Wildlife and Countryside Act Schedule 1 bird species. A variety of such birds could occur, and not all can necessarily be encompassed within the scope of a standard breeding bird survey (e.g. due to the timing of their breeding activity). The PEIR should provide more detail on the approach to Schedule 1 birds. Relevant species will include but may not be restricted to barn owl (which may nest in trees as well as buildings), quail, red kite, hobby and marsh harrier	<p>There is consideration and assessment of Schedule 1 bird species within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Supplementary data on breeding bird species known to be present in the vicinity of the study area is detailed in <b>es Volume 3, Appendix 7.2: Breeding Bird Survey [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b></p> <p>All receptors scoped into the assessment have been agreed with North Kesteven District Council (Lincolnshire County Council deferred to North Kesteven District Council on such matters).</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>Survey methods were not tailored specifically for quail. However, as quail were recorded during surveys, (despite being a difficult and ephemeral breeding species that can crop up almost anywhere) it is therefore deemed sufficient for the information required on which to make an assessment. The ES is based on the assumption that quail could be present during construction.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Notable flora is not specifically addressed within the survey scope. Plants are a relevant species consideration for purposes of PEA and impact assessment (e.g. refer to Box 2 in the PEA guidelines). I consider that specific consideration should be given to scarce arable flora that could occur in arable fields and be adversely affected by changes in land use. Botanical surveys may also be needed in support of evidence gathering to determine presence/absence of ancient woodland.</p>	<p>Targeted surveys for notable (non-crop) arable plants were carried out in June 2024.</p> <p>Woodlands adjacent to the Site did not meet the criteria for ancient woodland indicator species and are not shown on historic maps (pre-1600). They are therefore not considered likely to be ancient woodland.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Given the limited information and rationale provided, I am not in a position to agree that wintering bird surveys can be scoped out. I agree that because relevant designations are located at great distance the site is not likely to represent functionally linked habitat. However, (as with breeding birds) wintering birds are not solely a consideration in relation to designations. The site could still have value for wintering birds, and impacts could arise from the substantive land use change for the proposed development (extensive losses of arable farmland and the enclosing of the landscape).</p>	<p>Wintering bird surveys were undertaken between November 2023 and January 2024. They are considered to be of up to District importance and have been scoped in. Assessment and mitigation is detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>As advised above with reference to the questions posed, I agree with the approach to ecological impact assessment. This should reference the CIEEM (2022) guidance, as the current iteration of the good practice approach.</p> <p>The assessment should identify and show regard to relevant planning policy and related guidance, including and particularly National Policy Statements (NPS) EN-1, EN-3 and Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Ten in relation to Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). NPS EN-4 is not likely to have direct relevance (as its remit is pipelines), but its requirements in relation to ecology could be translated to cable laying for grid connections e.g. requirements in relation to reinstatement of habitats, and avoidance of important hedgerows.</p> <p>Given the progress made to date on ecological surveys, I consider that it will be possible to submit a relatively comprehensive and complete ecological impact assessment with the PEIR (as opposed to a more high-level assessment). I encourage this approach as it will permit detailed review and advice in advance of submission of the DCO Application.</p>	<p>Ecology surveys were ongoing at Phase Two Consultation, but have now been completed. It is considered that sufficient surveys have been carried out to inform the baseline and support a robust assessment of impacts on flora and fauna. Details of the surveys carried out are presented in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendices 7.1-7.13 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	<p>The assessment of potential direct and indirect effects on LWS needs to be made with reference to the reasons for designation, and the findings of other impact assessment disciplines (noise, air quality, water resources). Until this has been reported, I am not in a position to agree that there are no likely significant effects on LWS. I also cannot agree that the committed 15m stand-off distance is sufficient. Therefore, I do not agree that LWS can be scoped out</p>	<p>It is considered that impacts on LWS is avoided by buffer zones and mitigation detailed in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN101049/APP/7.7]</b>, except for four LWSs where impact is unavoidable due to requirement for highways access. Buffer zones from all other LWS are considered sufficient distance to avoid impacting the integrity of the LWS based on the LWS receptors and Proposed Development impacts. Details of the LWS and</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		assessment will be presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	I agree with the Scoping Report that impacts on birds will be an important consideration (see above) in terms of impact assessment and legislative/policy compliance.	Noted.
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	I agree that the lowland meadow priority habitat can be scoped out provided that the habitat is retained and that the proposed development would not prevent/obstruct potential for suitable long term management. This habitat could be a suitable target for habitat enhancement/BNG.	Due to amendment to the red line boundary there is no longer any lowland meadow within the Order Limits.
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	I cannot agree that hedgerows, other priority habitats or (with certain exceptions as identified below) relevant affected species can be scoped out as the relevant survey methods, results and rationale has not been provided to inform decision-making on this	Hedgerows which will be affected by the Proposed Development have been scoped in and assessment and mitigation detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> .  Habitat creation and improvement measures have been targeted along PRowS and along buffer zones of Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs), woodlands and other priority habitats. Measures are detailed in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> .
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	Section 6.2.9 of the Scoping Report gives the impression that the commitment to provide habitat mitigation/compensation has been relied on to scope habitats out. The first step is to identify the relative nature	The mitigation hierarchy will be applied: Impact to priority habitats and protected species will be avoided where possible or

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>conservation value and apply the mitigation hierarchy. Habitat compensation should be a last resort, especially where priority habitats would be affected</p>	<p>mitigated. Habitat compensation will be the last resort.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>I agree that there is likely to be a case, given commitments for habitat stand-offs, for scoping bats out. However, I defer a final decision on this until the survey results are provided at PEIR stage. This is because a specific uncertainty has been identified in Section 6.2.12. Further, the Scoping Report identifies the presence of barbastelle bat (a Red Data List species) and does not discount potential for this species to be affected</p>	<p>Bats have been scoped in. Assessment and mitigation is detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>The grounds for scoping out invertebrates, barn owl, water vole, otter and fish seems reasonable. I also agree reptiles can be scoped out provided the identified higher risk habitats are retained. Precautionary working methods would be sufficient to address the low risk of reptiles being encountered and affected in the wider site. No likely significant effects would reasonably be anticipated in relation to roe and fallow deer. However, they remain a welfare consideration. Further information is needed on how movement corridors can be maintained for deer, and how mammal gates could apply to animals as large as deer (given needs for security)</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>There will be a 10m buffer of the fencing from field margins, as secured in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>. The fencing design will allow deer to disperse across the Site via the field margins. Badgers and smaller mammals such as brown hare and hedgehog, will have access across the Site for foraging.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>The Applicant has not committed to a BNG assessment within the Scoping Report. A BNG assessment will be required to ensure consistency with preceding solar farm projects of comparable scale. This is also a requirement of emerging local planning policy. Biodiversity Metric 4.0 should be utilised unless substantive work has already progressed using Metric 3.1 (the preceding iteration of the metric, which remains approved for use where already adopted). Use of this metric will deliver a structured</p>	<p>As stated above, there is a commitment to deliver at least 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The latest metric has been used.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>repeatable evidence base for agreement that no net loss has been achieved, and that a meaningful biodiversity gain can be secured.</p>	
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>The identified opportunities (Section 6.2.10) seem a reasonable starting point. Therefore, I do not wish to make any additional recommendations for habitat creation or enhancement at this time. I agree with the commitment to provide an outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) with the final application</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>I recommend that the applicant reviews their list to ensure that mitigation measures are not presented as enhancement opportunities. Mammal gates fall into this category. Similarly, arable interventions would likely represent mitigation for impacts on birds from loss of arable farmland elsewhere within the site.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>I do not consider drystone walls to represent meaningful biodiversity enhancement, although they may have incidental benefits for a limited suite of species (but likely less so that creation of semi-natural habitats e.g. hedgerows).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Further explanation is needed for the proposed 'herbal ley' and associated management regimes before it can be agreed that this would deliver meaningful benefits for biodiversity. Particularly, given the impact on farmland birds from changes in land use. With reference to standard definitions, ley usually represents a temporary land-use rather than permanent habitat creation. So, use of this terminology suggests this habitat would not be comparable with wildflower meadow and may need regular replacement sowings to maintain a biodiversity value. Further, a brief internet search indicates such seed mixes are typically marketed as forage for livestock and to improve soil fertility, rather than for purposes of biodiversity enhancement.</p>	<p>Herbal ley would be a temporary 'cover crop' or 'green manure' such as legumes (vetches, like common vetch and hairy vetch. clovers, like red clover, white clover, alsike clover, sweet clover and crimson clover) which would provide nectar for insects and nitrogen to the soil. Further detail is set out and secured within the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Given the characteristics of the affected landscape and its habitats, and the species likely to be associated with these, I cannot identify any likely cumulative effects. However, given the limited information received, this would need to be reviewed in more detail at PEIR stage.</p> <p>In terms of 'intra-project effects', I consider these should be addressed in the main biodiversity impact assessment chapter so that a single cohesive assessment of the impacts and effects of the Proposed Development is reported. This should consider the conclusions of other relevant chapters in more detail (e.g. any potential significant air quality impacts). For example, a combined summary of habitat losses will need to be reported (regardless of the activities contributing to this) for purposes of impact and BNG assessment, and to transparently demonstrate that no net loss and net gain has been achieved</p>	<p>An assessment has been undertaken of the inter-project and intra-project cumulative effects, related to each environmental factor which is detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effects [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. This chapter sets out the methodology for carrying out the assessment, the Zone of Influence for each environmental factor that has been assessed, the short list of other developments assessed, mitigation and the likely inter and intra-project cumulative effects. No significant inter-project cumulative effects have been identified in the assessment.</p>
<p><b>Historic Environment Officer</b></p>		
<p><b>Historic Environment Officer</b></p>	<p>The Report states that the study areas have been defined as 2km from the site boundary for non-designated heritage assets and 5km for designated historic assets in accordance with the document ('Guidance for large schemes including NSIPs and EIAs, General Scoping Opinion for the Historic Environment') provided by Lincolnshire County Council (LCC). The LCC guidance also sets out the data sources that should be included to inform the baseline conditions. From the list of sources included in the Report (6.4.3) some have yet to be consulted / interrogated.</p> <p>The Report notes consultation with LCC, and an intention to consult with Historic England and the local planning authority's (LPA's) conservation officer. Consultation on the cultural heritage, relating to matters on archaeology, should also include the archaeological advisor to the LPA, North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Sources within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment</b>, have been assessed following the Chartered Institute of Archaeology Standards and Guidance.</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Historic Environment Officer</b></p>	<p>The report notes that a full desk-based assessment including aerial photographic and Lidar data will be produced. The full suite of desk-based information needs to be assessed to inform the baseline.</p> <p>The baseline conditions as mentioned in the report focus on the HER data and number of non-designated and designated assets recorded and therefore represents only a partial evidence base.</p> <p>A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for geophysical survey has been agreed with LCC.</p>	<p>A full Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, aerial investigation and mapping report, geophysical survey and targeted trial trenching have informed the baseline for <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Details regarding the above are within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment , Appendix 9.3 Aerial Investigation Report and Appendix 9.4: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN0101049/APP/7.15]</b> has been prepared setting out the proposed strategy for further evaluation at detailed design stage and mitigation measures for known heritage assets.</p>
<p><b>Historic Environment Officer</b></p>	<p>The report states only that the need for, scope and timing of intrusive evaluation will be negotiated and agreed with statutory consultees following completion of the desk-based and geophysical surveys.</p>	<p>As noted above, the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, aerial investigation and mapping and geophysical survey results informed the scope of trenching,</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>The proposals for construction of a solar farm will necessarily have an impact on any buried archaeological remains. Piling, building foundations, cable trenching, access roads, building compounds and construction traffic are all known impacts and the cumulative effect will be significant. Therefore, trial trenching is required to establish the baseline conditions and to understand the nature and extent of the impacts on the archaeological remains. There is currently insufficient information on the presence, character, date and significance of any archaeological deposits. The results of the full desk-based assessment including the aerial photographic and Lidar assessments together with the results of the geophysical survey will inform the programme of trial trench evaluation. In order to determine the presence, absence, significance, the depth and extent of any archaeological remains which could be impacted by the development, trial trenching should target areas where archaeological remains have been identified in the foregoing, non-intrusive surveys as well as areas where the surveys have not detected archaeological remains. The programme of trial trenching should be set out in a written scheme of investigation (WSI) to be agreed with the archaeological consultees prior to commencement of the field investigation. The results of the trial trenching and foregoing surveys will inform the archaeological mitigation strategy</p>	<p>and it is considered appropriate for further trenching to be secured as a Development Consent Order Requirement as has been done for other solar farms (e.g. Mallard Pass).</p> <p>Details regarding the above are within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Appendix 9.3: Aerial Investigation Report and Appendix 9.5: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b></p>
<p><b>Historic Environment Officer</b></p>	<p>It is proposed that where primary mitigation (by design) is not feasible that additional mitigation (6.4.6) will take the form of a programme of archaeological investigation and recording secured by a DCO Requirement. Such a programme may include pre-commencement phases of archaeological excavation and / or archaeological “watching brief” during construction.</p> <p>There is currently insufficient information to determine the nature and scope of the mitigation (whether by design or through archaeological</p>	<p>As noted above, the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and targeted trial trenching have informed the masterplan in order to minimize impacts on archaeological remains, and have informed <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and an</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>investigation). A trial trench evaluation is required in order to establish the baseline conditions, provide an appropriate assessment of the significance of likely effects and inform the mitigation strategy.</p> <p>Mitigation through archaeological excavation may be required. Without detailed information on the archaeological potential and the likely impact of the proposals mitigation by means of a 'watching brief' during construction is not considered acceptable as a first response. The results of the assessments and site specific evaluation will inform the archaeological mitigation strategy. The results should be used to minimise the impact on the historic environment through informing the project design and an appropriate programme of archaeological mitigation (secured in the DCO)</p>	<p><b>outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> for further trial trenching to inform the detailed design. It is considered appropriate for further trenching to be secured as a Development Consent Order Requirement as has been done for other solar farms (e.g. Mallard Pass).</p>
<p><b>Historic Environment Officer</b></p>	<p>The likely significant effects (6.4.7) cannot be determined in the absence of an assessment of the baseline conditions. The section acknowledges the uncertainty of potential direct and indirect effects. It is not considered appropriate to propose that certain heritage assets be scoped out at this stage.</p>	<p>The Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has considered the significance of all heritage assets within 2km of the Site and all designated assets within 5km. Those sensitive to construction effects considered against the proposed masterplan for the Site have been assessed, and those where the importance of the asset and the magnitude of impact would result in a significant effect (without mitigation) are included in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. Those assets sensitive to changes in their setting have been filtered based on a worst case ZTV and where the importance of the asset and</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Historic Environment Officer</b>	<p>The assets proposed to be scoped out of assessment (6.4.9) are not supported by an evidence base and appear to be piecemeal and based largely on setting effects (rather than an assessment of the significance of the asset and the likely impact of the proposals) or on the type of record (for example findspots). Any proposal to 'descope' designated or relevant non-designated assets must be informed by an evidence base demonstrating the lack of direct or indirect impact upon the heritage asset and its significance.</p> <p>The Settings Assessment/Heritage Impact Assessment needs to demonstrate an understanding of the significance and context of each of those assets in order to assess the impact of the development upon them and propose any mitigation.</p> <p>Section 6.4.9 of the Scoping Report also proposes scoping out all heritage assets at decommissioning. The nature of these assets has yet to be determined and assessed and, for example where identified assets may have been avoided / protected in situ during construction / operation they may be under threat from disturbance or destruction during decommissioning. Cultural heritage should be a consideration as part of any outline decommissioning plans.</p> <p>The section entitled 'Opportunities for enhancing the environment' (6.4.10) has not considered the positive and / or beneficial effects of the programme of archaeological surveys and investigations to be undertaken during this process and the added value that a large development can make to archaeology and cultural heritage. The programme of</p>	<p>magnitude of impact would result in a significant effect (without mitigation) have been included in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has considered the significance of all heritage assets within 2km of the Site and all designated assets within 5km. Those sensitive to construction effects have been considered within the Site and those sensitive to changes in their setting have been filtered based on a worst case ZTV.</p> <p>Within the <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> Table 3.4: Cultural Heritage and an <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b> Table 3.4: Cultural Heritage ensures that heritage assets do not impact during construction and are not affected by operational (including maintenance) activity or decommissioning effects.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Historic Environment Officer</b></p>	<p>archaeological works should include proposals for community outreach, public engagement and dissemination of the results</p> <p>Reference should be made to planning and specialist cultural heritage and archaeological guidance and standards and should include the Lincolnshire County Council Archaeology Handbook (2019) which sets out requirements for work in the county, including archiving and deposition. In summary, the EIA will need to contain sufficient information on the archaeological potential and must include evidential information on the depth, extent and significance of the archaeological deposits which will be impacted by the development. The results will inform a fit for purpose mitigation strategy which will identify what measures are to be taken to minimise or adequately record the impact of the proposal on archaeological remains.</p> <p>The provision of sufficient baseline information to identify and assess the impact on known and potential heritage assets is required by Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Regulation 5 (2d)), National Planning Statement Policy EN1 (Section 5.8), and the National Planning Policy Framework</p>	<p>The relevant local and national guidance and standards including the Lincolnshire County Council Archaeology Handbook (2019) is referred to in preparing are included in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and supporting appendices.</p> <p>As noted above, the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, aerial investigation and mapping, geophysical survey results and targeted trial trenching, have informed the masterplan, ES and <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> and it is considered appropriate for further trenching to inform the detailed design to be secured as a Development Consent Order Requirement as has been done for other solar farms (e.g. Mallard Pass).</p> <p>Details regarding the above are within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment , Appendix 9.3: Aerial</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p><b>Investigation Report and Appendix 9.5: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b></p>
<p><b>Historic Environment Officer</b></p>	<p>Do you agree with the proposed list of consultees?                      No, the archaeological advisor to the local planning authority should be included.</p>	<p>North Kesteven District Council's archaeological advisor has also been consulted.                      Details of consultation held to date are included within the <b>Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1].</b></p>
<p><b>Historic Environment Officer</b></p>	<p>Do you agree with the proposed study areas?                      Yes, the report defines a study area of 2km for non-designated heritage assets and 5km for designated heritage.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Historic Environment Officer</b></p>	<p>Do you agree that the data sources listed to inform the EIA baseline characterisation are appropriate?                      Yes, if a full desk-based assessment is provided in accordance with the guidance provided by LCC.</p>	<p>Full Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment included as <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3].</b></p>
<p><b>Historic Environment Officer</b></p>	<p>Do you agree that the surveys proposed to inform the EIA baseline characterisation are appropriate?                      No, geophysical survey has been included, however, a programme of archaeological trial trenching has not been included and is required to inform the baseline conditions, an appropriate assessment of impact and the mitigation strategy.</p>	<p>As noted above, the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, aerial investigation and mapping, geophysical survey results and targeted trial trenching, have informed the masterplan, the ES and <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> and it is considered appropriate for further trenching to inform the detailed design to be secured as a</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Historic Environment Officer</b>	<p>Are any receptors / assets / resources not identified that you would like to see included in the EIA?                      All heritage assets as identified through the EIA process should be included (the required assessments, surveys and investigations have yet to be carried out).</p>	<p>Development Consent Order Requirement as has been done for other solar farms (e.g. Mallard Pass).</p> <p>Details regarding the above are within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Appendix 9.3: Aerial Investigation Report and Appendix 9.5: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>All heritage assets within 2km of the Site and all designated assets within 5km have been included in the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment. Those where significant effects are predicted (based on the asset's importance and the predicted magnitude of impact) are included in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Historic Environment Officer</b></p>	<p>Do you agree with the proposed additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation measures and is this mitigation appropriate?                      No. Insufficient information is available to understand the mitigation measures that may be required. A programme of archaeological trial trenching is required to inform an appropriate mitigation strategy to be included in the Environmental Statement</p>	<p>As noted above, the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, aerial investigation and mapping, geophysical survey results and targeted trial trenching, have informed the masterplan, ES and <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> and it is considered appropriate for further trenching to inform the detailed design to be secured as a Development Consent Order Requirement as has been done for other solar farms (e.g. Mallard Pass).</p> <p>Detailed information can be found within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Appendix 9.3: Aerial Investigation Report and Appendix 9.5: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Historic Environment Officer</b></p>	<p>Do you agree with the receptors / matters that are proposed to be scoped in and out of the EIA?                      No. As the evidence base and assessments have yet to be carried out or completed no receptors / matters should be scoped out of the EIA at this stage.</p>	<p>As noted above, the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, aerial investigation and mapping, geophysical survey results and targeted trial trenching, have informed the ES. All heritage assets within 2km of the Site and all designated assets within</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>5km have been included in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. Those where significant effects are predicted (based on the asset's importance and the predicted magnitude of impact) are included in the ES.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN010149/APP/7.15]</b> has been submitted, completion of this additional trial trenching will inform the detailed design of the Scheme and is anticipated to be secured by a Development Consent Order Requirement. It is considered appropriate for further trenching to inform the detailed design to be secured as a Development Consent Order Requirement as has been done for other solar farms (e.g. Mallard Pass).</p>
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>		
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	It is important that the ALC survey is undertaken in line with the MAFF 1988 guidelines and TIN049. These documents set out the precise methodology by which the ALC survey should be undertaken, with auger bore sampling at 1 hectare intervals and a suitable number of soil pits dug to determine the precise nature of the soil(s).	The survey has been undertaken in line with the MAFF 1988 guidelines and TIN049.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>According to available published data and local knowledge, the soils locally are mainly Marcham 343e and Aswarby 512a Soil Associations. Both of these soils are limestone based, with shallow well drained loamy soils, over limestone and deeper brown earths. Occasionally there are heavier clay soils present of the Curdridge 841a Association. Appendix 3 sets out a description of each of these three soil associations from Cranfield University.</p> <p>The area locally is known as The Heath. Previous ALC surveys locally on these soils and similar have indicated a mixture of Grades 2, 3a and 3b land. It is likely that the shallower soils will be 3b, whilst deeper soils will be 3a or Grade 2, even with some areas of Grade 1.</p> <p>The ALC should identify where BMV land is and the scheme should seek to protect and minimise damage to higher grade land wherever possible in line with national planning policy. There is undoubtedly a lot of BMV land in this vicinity and only a full ALC will identify where it is and what the Grade and quality is. Laboratory analysis of representative samples should be used to determine textures.</p>	<p>An <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b> has been prepared to ensure the protection and conservation of soil resources on Site.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Where land is used for biodiversity it would not be available for agriculture. However even if it is available for some form of cutting or grazing it is unlikely that the ALC grade will change significantly during the life of the project. There is evidence that organic matter builds up in biodiversity areas at a faster rate than arable farmland and this may benefit the land, but it is not a factor in the assessment of ALC. Long term, where biodiverse land becomes ecologically important there is the possibility of land becoming assigned with environmental designations, such as SSSI status, though generally this has not so far occurred on other solar sites.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Revisions to the Environmental Impact Assessment rules regarding the cultivation of agricultural land suggest that if land remains uncultivated for</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>longer than five years, then permission may be required from Natural England to bring the land back into arable cultivation.</p> <p>Any material enhancement in the botanical diversity of the sward (to the extent that this site is considered to be of ecological value), will limit the capacity for the land to be returned to arable use after the solar plant has been decommissioned. The EIA (Agriculture) (England) (No.2) Regulations 2006 prohibit the physical or chemical cultivation of what are considered to be 'semi-natural areas'.</p> <p>Cultivation is not clearly defined and does not necessarily require land to have been ploughed. The application of pesticides and fertiliser may be sufficient, but the biodiverse areas are much less likely to receive these treatments once established and there is the possibility that large areas of environmentally interesting land may therefore not be allowed to return to arable farmland after the 40 year period. This is a complex area as there may be planning conditions that require land to be returned to agriculture as part of any consent and it is an open question whether the compliance with a 'restoration' condition 'trumps' any future environmental status or requirement.</p> <p>Grazing management at this Site is not easily compatible with standard biodiversity management practices at Solar Photovoltaic sites due to fundamental population biology principles. As the site is in arable production at present, it currently has a relatively low level of biodiversity. The grazing management plan may, therefore, lead to a modest increase in species richness at the site from current base levels, but it will not deliver the level of biodiversity that the site could potentially achieve if biodiversity gains were prioritised over agricultural production.</p> <p>By grazing land for agricultural livestock production, the level of disturbance is high. This prevents plant species with a slow establishment rate (which often are those which are ultimately strong competitors) from</p>	<p>Noted. An <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> has been prepared and submitted in support of the DCO Application which includes measures for vegetation management and grazing. The <b>oLEMP [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b> includes a detailed vegetation management programme for habitats which details the steps for managing each proposed habitat</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
North Kesteven District Council	<p>growing – and thus the invertebrates that feed on these species are also excluded from the area.</p> <p>Areas which promote high species diversity often use low intensity grazing as a means to promoting biodiversity. Grazing represents a form of disturbance to the area, thus preventing any one species becoming too dominant. It also helps manage the sward to provide an optimum habitat for invertebrates.</p> <p>Grazing for biodiversity enhancement usually occurs between October and April, which will allow plants to flower and set seed. The stock densities are monitored and adjusted to prevent either under and overgrazing and to ensure the sward contains a mix of long and short vegetation with some plants in flower.</p> <p>There is therefore some conflict between maintaining the land in agricultural production and improving biodiversity. Whilst not incompatible, site based issues, such as soil type(s) and local agricultural practices may create future problems. Often biodiversity areas particularly target the highest grades on agricultural land and any future restriction that might prevent its return to cultivation should be a consideration in the planning process and in the conditioning of any consent.</p> <p>There are a number of small(er) and largescale Solar PV schemes in Lincolnshire, with others planned or proposed. There are five known solar project NSIP schemes; specifically in relation to impacts on agricultural land. The situation is a moving picture as new proposals come forward from time to time. Most of these sites are proposed on farmland.</p> <p>Lincolnshire and N Kesteven in particular are agricultural areas with substantial areas for land within the Best and Most Versatile category. Much of the non BMV land will be Grades 3b and 4 with very little Grade 5. A county-level alternative assessment area should be applied which as a minimum should consider scope for connection into the National Grid at the</p>	<p>and the month of the year (from year 6 to year 30) each step should be undertaken</p> <p>An assessment of the ALC for land within the Order Limits is provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>, along with a discussion of the use of BMV and non-BMV land for temporary and permanent uses as part of the Proposed Development.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>locations proposed by the registered NSIP solar projects named above, and with specific consideration of agricultural land impacts.                      For a project of this scale where the project will tie up the land for up to 40 years, there will be some impact. The area is large locally and if the quantities of BMV are as expected or similar then the impact will be moderately significant. However if the BMV is greater and of higher grades then I would expect the impact to be more significant at a District Level. Environmental Impact Assessments give guidance on the size and quality of Land Grade that is or can be affected by development proposals. The loss of such a large area of land would normally be considered as significant at District level, even though the use is 'temporary'. Any permanent loss of land due either to construction or through biodiversity designation may affect this assessment further.</p> <p>This part of Lincolnshire is a mainly arable farming area with only limited sheep grazing operations. Whilst it is perfectly possible to graze the areas under and between the panels, it is unlikely to be very cost effective for a grazier. The difficulties of rounding up sheep and handling them, together with finding sick or wounded animals makes the grazier's workload harder and more complex.                      As such the economics of moving sheep to and from the site will be marginal. However, most examples quoted do not charge much or anything for the grazing and this may make it sufficiently attractive for a local farmer or shepherd with a 'flying flock'.                      Land in use for solar panels is generally ineligible for the normal agricultural subsidies, such as the Basic Payment Scheme (now being phased out) and the Environmental Land Management Scheme (ELMS). It does not prevent land from being managed in similar ways, but there will be no payments available to farmers (e.g. graziers) for compliance and this could make farming less financially attractive going forward.</p>	<p>There is a potential to use the open spaces between the Solar PV modules for pastoral farming (sheep grazing) during the operation (including maintenance) phase, and therefore some agricultural use of the Site can occur during the lifespan of the Proposed Development. It should be noted that although conditions suitable for grazing can be maintained, the Applicant will not be responsible for making arrangements for grazing.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>The site will probably have to be (re)seeded to grass, or species rich grassland, but this will probably occur after the panels have been sited on the land. In my experience grass does not grow well under the panels themselves. There are often areas that are dry and barren or that only host weeds species, due to heavy shading.</p> <p>As part of any environmental statement there should be an impact statement with reference to the farm holdings affected by the proposal. This should address viability, infrastructure and long term consequences on the individual holding.</p>	<p>An assessment on the impacts to agricultural businesses and tourism is included within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. No significant impacts are anticipated.</p> <p>Land under and between solar panels will be used to deliver biodiversity benefits in accordance with Project Principles included within the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b>. Further detail on the proposed planting under Solar PV panels and how these will be managed is set out and secured in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>Soil structure can be significantly damaged during the construction phase of the process. There is a lot of trafficking of vehicles on the land to erect the panels and if this work is undertaken when soils are wet, there can be significant damage. Much of this damage can be remedied post construction but not all and it is possible that long term drainage issues occur on the site due to the construction. Appendix 4 shows photographs of before during and after construction of a large solar farm in Hampshire where soil structural issues were a major problem post construction. Once the panels are in place usual agricultural practices such as subsoiling become difficult</p> <p>During the construction phase many of the areas will affect soil and water issues. Appendix 5 sets out a basic Soil Management Plan that should be established as part of the Construction Phase, to minimise the impact on</p>	<p>Measures to ensure the quality of the land is maintained throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development is documented within and secured by the <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b> and the <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b>. The <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b> identifies those areas within the Site which may be more susceptible to damage, for example, steep slopes and qualities of the</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>soil resources. The following headings should be included in the Soil Management Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site preparation;</li> <li>• Import of construction materials, plant and equipment to Site;</li> <li>• Establishment of Site construction compounds and welfare facilities;</li> <li>• Cable installation;</li> <li>• Temporary construction compounds;</li> <li>• Trenching in sections</li> <li>• Upgrading existing tracks and construction of new access • roads within the Site;</li> <li>• The upgrade or construction of crossing points (bridges /culverts) at drainage ditches within the Site;</li> <li>• Appropriate storage and capping of soil;</li> <li>• Appropriate construction drainage;</li> <li>• Sectionalised approach of duct installation;</li> <li>• Excavation and installation of jointing pits;</li> <li>• Cable pulling;</li> <li>• Testing and commissioning; and</li> <li>• Site reinstatement (i.e. returning any land used during construction, for temporary purposes, back to its previous condition).</li> <li>• Use of borrow pits</li> </ul>	<p>soil, for example when it is wet or after periods of heavy rainfall or high winds and advises on when soils are suitable for being handled or trafficked. The <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b> also details measures for soil management and follows the principles of best practice to maintain the physical properties of the soil, with the aim of maintaining the condition of the land until the end of the lifetime of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Further detail related to soil management and mitigation is provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Use of borrow pits do not form part of the proposal.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>1. The soil stripping, handling, storage and replacement operations should be undertaken in a manner that is consistent with suitable specification and methodology set out in a Soil Management Plan.</p>	<p>This is set out in the <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b> submitted and secured as part of the Development Consent Order.</p>
<p><b>North Kesteven District Council</b></p>	<p>2. All topsoil and subsoil material shall be stripped from areas affected by top soil storage bunds, subsoil storage bunds, general fill bunds, hard-standings and other constructions including temporary access roads and vehicle trafficking routes, and shall be stored separately in bunds from any imported material and shall be used for the restoration of the temporary soil</p>	<p>Soil stripping, storing and restoration operations should only occur when the soils are as dry as reasonably practicable,</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	storage site unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.	normally when they are below the plastic limit. A suitably trained person should test the soil plasticity prior to soil handling operations, following the procedure detailed below in <b>Tables 2, 3 and 4.</b>
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	3. Soils should be stripped, stored and replaced in line with the MAFF Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils Sheets 1, 2, 3 and 4 - <a href="http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090306103114/http://www.defra.gov.uk/farm/environment/land-use/soilguid/index.htm">http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090306103114/http://www.defra.gov.uk/farm/environment/land-use/soilguid/index.htm</a>	Soil would be stripped, stored and replaced in line with the MAFF Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils Sheets.
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	4. Topsoil and subsoil storage bunds should be placed in approved locations and constructed to ensure secure storage without damage, loss or contamination.	All topsoil and subsoil material shall be stripped from the areas affected by top soil storage bunds, subsoil storage bunds, general fill bunds, hard-standing areas used for the temporary construction compounds and access tracks and, shall be stored separately in bunds from any imported material and shall be used for the restoration of the temporary soil storage unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	5. Topsoil and subsoil should be stored in bunds not exceeding 3m in height above adjacent existing ground level and shall be constructed and shaped by excavator only (dump trucks should not traffic across the bunds at any time).	Topsoil will be stored in bunds no taller than 2m high and lightly formed to consolidate the surface and shed water. Any stripped subsoil will be stored in bunds up to 3m high.
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	6. Imported general fill material should be stored in bunds not exceeding 4m in height above adjacent existing ground level.	10. The stripping, movement and re-spreading of topsoil and subsoil material should only be undertaken when the topsoil and subsoil material is
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	7. Bunds should be seeded to grass at the earliest opportunity and shall not be allowed to overwinter without grass cover.	
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	8. No topsoil or subsoil should be sold or otherwise removed from the site.	
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	9. Within 3 months of their construction, the Developer should provide a detailed plan of soil storage bunds showing details of position, volume and soil type. The Developer shall be responsible for maintaining an up-to-date record of all soil storage and general fill bunds throughout the life of the site.	
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	10. The stripping, movement and re-spreading of topsoil and subsoil material should only be undertaken when the topsoil and subsoil material is	



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
North Kesteven District Council	<p>in a dry and friable condition and the ground is sufficiently dry to allow the passage of heavy machinery and vehicles over it without damage to the soils</p> <p>11. All injurious weeds, as defined by the Weeds Act 1959, growing within the working site should be eradicated or adequately controlled by approved method</p>	<p>No imported general fill material is expected therefore this is not being considered in the <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b>.</p> <p>The soil bund should be seeded with a suitable grass mix.</p>
North Kesteven District Council	<p>12. All vegetation growing on soil storage bunds and peripheral areas within the site should be kept in tidy condition by cutting at least once during the growing season.</p>	<p>No topsoil or subsoil will be sold or removed from Site.</p>
North Kesteven District Council	<p>13. The boundary of the development should be made stock proof for the duration of the temporary development</p>	<p>A record should be kept of soil placed into storage on the Site. Each bund should be identified with the soil volume and soil unit.</p>
North Kesteven District Council	<p>14. All temporary plant, machinery, buildings, fixed equipment, roads and areas of hard standing including site compounds should be removed.</p>	<p>All soil trafficking and handling operations will be undertaken under the supervision of an appropriately trained and experienced person, who will advise on and supervise soil handling, including identifying when soils are dry enough to be handled.</p>
North Kesteven District Council	<p>15. The natural subsoil base material should be comprehensively ripped to a minimum depth of 500mm to break up surface compaction before any soil material is spread. The developer should give the Planning Authority notice of an intention to carry out this operation. All large stones and boulders, wire rope and other foreign material arising should be removed. Special attention should be given to areas of excessive compaction such as haul roads where deeper ripping may be necessary.</p>	<p>Any injurious weeds, as defined by the Weeds Act 1959, growing within the Site will be eradicated or adequately controlled by approved methods.</p>
North Kesteven District Council	<p>16. The Developer should be responsible for providing all necessary training of operatives and site supervision by suitably qualified personnel to ensure that the soil replacement operation is carried out in the approved manner.</p>	<p>Approximately a month prior to restoration, soil stockpiles should be strimmed, cuttings</p>
North Kesteven District Council	<p>17. Prior to the commencement of spreading soil, all stones, boulders or foreign objects likely to impede normal agricultural cultivations should be removed from that area.</p>	

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	18. The soil material set aside for use in any agricultural restoration should be spread uniformly in the correct sequence (subsoil followed by topsoil) over the ripped base material, and should be rooted and scarified to full depth without causing mixing between different soil layers. The reinstated agricultural soil profile should be total 450mm thickness overlying prepared and free draining natural stony base material, and should consist of 250mm topsoil and 200mm subsoil derived from the soil stripping operation. This soil profile should meet the technical requirements of the identified Agricultural Land Classification Grade on restoration.	<p>removed and remaining vegetation sprayed with a systemic herbicide as advised by a suitably qualified person.</p> <p>450mm thickness soil profile with stoney based material is deemed not suitable for the Proposed Development soil type but relevant measures are to be included in the <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.11]</b></p>
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	19. All base material ripping, soil spreading and cultivation operations should be carried out in such a manner as to minimise compaction and achieve unimpeded drainage down through the soil profile.	All operations will be handled by a suitable trained person.
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	20. Any part of the site restored for agricultural purposes which is affected by localised settlement that adversely affects the agricultural after use should be re-graded including the re-construction of the soil profile to approved specification.	Any limestone removed should be temporarily stored separately from soil (alongside the trench) and then restored using the same 'last out first in' principle as with the soils in order to retain the original soil profile.
<b>North Kesteven District Council</b>	21. Following restoration of the soil materials, the land will be cultivated, seeded and managed appropriately for a minimum of a year and until agreed with the Local Planning Authority that the land meets satisfactory requirements.	<p>It is likely that the soil which was beneath the stoned surface will require subsoiling to remove compaction. A soil scientist or suitably trained person will assess the depth and severity of compaction to inform the type and depth of subsoiling operation.</p> <p>It is likely that the soil which was beneath the stoned surface will require subsoiling to</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		remove compaction. A soil scientist or suitably trained person will assess the depth and severity of compaction to inform the type and depth of subsoiling operation.
<b>Nottinghamshire County Council</b>		
<b>Nottinghamshire CC</b>	Thank you for consulting Nottinghamshire CC on the above, we have no comments to make at this stage of the process.	Noted.
<b>Peterborough City Council</b>		
<b>Peterborough City Council</b>	The Local Planning Authority has no comments or observations.	Noted.
<b>Severn Trent Water</b>		
<b>Severn Trent Water</b>	Please be advised that the site boundary is outside STW's area of responsibility	Noted.
<b>South Holland District Council</b>		
<b>South Holland District Council</b>	I confirm that South Holland District Council has no comment to make	Noted.
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>		
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	The words 'explored' and 'recreational connectivity' are not specific enough in the ES. The area Springwell East in particular has a very high density of PROW which need full recognition in the scoping report	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The design has incorporated a 15m offset from the Perimeter fencing to all existing PROW. We acknowledge that the PROWs particularly in Springwell East are well used and this has been a factor we have considered in the development of the</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	Particular concerns regarding lighting, fencing and security cameras. The extent, duration and intensity of lighting needs to be fully illuminated.	<p>design. Further detail is included in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The potential visual effects on users of PROWs are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The lighting will be manually operated for the Springwell Substation compound, BESS compounds, and Collector Compounds, therefore, it would not be permanently lit. Further detail is provided in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Proposed Development only uses fencing where needed (e.g. around areas of Solar PV development, or the Springwell Substation) and seeks to use sensitive specifications where practicable to reduce potential impacts. Different types of fencing will be used for different areas of the Proposed Development to provide the appropriate levels of safety and security. For example, wooden post and wire fencing for areas of Solar PV development,</p>

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

and mesh or palisade fencing for Springwell Substation. These are set out in the **Design Commitments**

**[EN10149/APP/7.4]** which include commitments on the following:

- Perimeter fencing around the Solar PV development will comprise a timber post and wire mesh fence to minimise visual impact.
- Perimeter fencing around the Solar PV development will be offset from existing vegetation and other environmental features to reduce potential impacts.
- Perimeter fencing will permit the passage of wildlife, either through a clearance at ground level or via mammal gates.

CCTV cameras would use night-vision technology, which would be monitored remotely and avoid the need for night-time lighting. For security requirements, Passive Infra-red Detector (PID) systems (or similar) will be installed around the Solar PV field perimeter to provide the CCTVs night vision functionality and would be sited away from residential properties to avoid any light spill that could lead to sleep disturbances or anxiety.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Despite these factors being scoped in we have additional expectations in aspects of biodiversity, cultural heritage, landscape and visual and Land, soils, and groundwater. As residents of Scopwick and Kirkby Green, the Springwell East development in particular will have a major impact on the ability of our community to enjoy local countryside and we seek to minimise this potential impact on our health and wellbeing.</p> <p>It should be recognised that Scopwick and Kirkby Green are two of the most attractive villages in Lincolnshire and welcome many visitors and tourists. The potential restriction on local business development and its future sustainability needs to be fully explored and mitigated.</p> <p>In conclusion, this proposed development has already generated very strong opposition by a large number of parishioners at recent public meetings. The scale of this development and impact on the landscape is beyond what any parish of our size should be expected to accept.</p>	<p>The visual effects on users of PROWs are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The assessment acknowledges that there would be some significant visual effects on certain public rights of way, particularly during construction and in the early years of operation. Following Phase 2 consultation, further details have been provided on the mitigation proposals, specifically the proposed green infrastructure, which is illustrated in <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 3.3 Green Infrastructure Parameters Plan [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>. Following establishment, there would remain some significant effects on visual amenity, but these would be much reduced in terms of both scale and geographic extent</p> <p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> provides further detail on the impact to local businesses and tourism.</p> <p>There will be no significant effects on occupancy rates of local accommodation providers during the construction or</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	The Rochdale Envelope approach was developed to assist with the development of much large national infrastructure projects such as HS2 where at the start it is difficult to know what matters will be relevant as the project develops. This flexible approach is not appropriate for a	<p>operational phase and therefore there will be no impact on these hospitality and tourist businesses.</p> <p>Heritage assets within Scopwick and Kirkby Green have been included in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> and have informed the masterplan to minimise the impacts on these assets.</p> <p>This has concluded that there would be no significant effects on built heritage assets within the study area, and that effects on below ground heritage assets (archaeological remains) can be avoided or mitigated through further archaeological investigation secured by a DCO Requirement. The archaeological mitigation would also provide public benefits through increased knowledge of the cultural heritage resource of the Order Limits.</p>
		The approach to assessment in the Environmental Statement is set out in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Approach to EIA [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> . Following the Phase

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>development of this limited and static nature where the matters to be considered can be determined at the start. Its use in this context would be an abuse of the process allowing the Applicants to change their plans at will without proper scrutiny.</p>	<p>2 Consultation, alternative BESS and substation locations have been narrowed down in each case to a single location. Previously considered alternative locations presented in the Phase 2 Consultation have been dismissed. Therefore, the submitted application provides greater certainty regarding the proposed location of these components of the project infrastructure. As explained fully in the above referenced chapter of the ES it is necessary to maintain a degree of flexibility in the layout of the BESS and substation. The Rochdale Envelope approach ensures that the reasonable worst case scenario is assessed in the ES.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>The Proposed Development will include landscaping, habitat management, biodiversity enhancement, and amenity improvements, which will be explored as the design progresses. This will be sensitivity designed to retain and enhance ecological and recreational connectivity. Where possible, existing trees, hedgerows, public rights of way and Local Wildlife Sites would be retained.</p> <p>The words 'explored' and 'recreational connectivity' are not specific enough again the information in the ES needs to be more specific</p>	<p>Further detail is included within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>A reinstatement and habitat creation programme would commence following the construction phase. This would include landscaping, habitat management and biodiversity enhancement. Areas under the Solar PV modules and the landscape buffers would be planted with native grassland, wildflower, scrub and</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>hedgerows. Woodland blocks and belts would be planted strategically to provide visual screening and ecological habitats to achieve a biodiversity net gain. The reinstatement and creation of the landscape and habitat will be undertaken in accordance with the commitments set out in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010149/APP/7.4]</b>. All measures will be documented within and secured by the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>The National Grid Substation compound, Project Substation compound, BESS compounds, and Collector Compounds would include lighting, in accordance with relevant standards, but will not be permanently lit. Just lit after dark? Needs to be specific</p>	<p>The National Grid Navenby Substation no longer forms part of the Proposed Development.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>The use of borrow pits during construction of the Proposed Development will be considered as the design develops. The potential benefit of including borrow pits as part of the Proposed Development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows extracted aggregate to be transported to construction locations (largely via site access tracks) within the Site.</li> <li>• Generates significantly lower levels of Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements on the local highway network than importation of aggregate from commercial quarries.</li> <li>• Reduces cost risks arising from double handling, importation from commercial quarries and landfill disposal.</li> </ul> <p>The benefit of using borrow pits will be carefully considered against any potential environmental impacts. Further detail on the approach to identifying suitable borrow pit locations and justification for their inclusions</p>	<p>No borrow pits are proposed as part of the Proposed Development.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>as part of the Proposed Development will be provided as part of the PEIR and ES.</p> <p>Comment Received This is a cost cutting exercise allowing the Developers to quarry their own aggregate out of the heath sub-soils to use to build temporary roads and hardstandings; further details and approval from the Environment Agency should be gained. The land where borrow pits are excavated will never be returned to proper agricultural use and this procedure should be prohibited as unnecessary and open to abuse. Unnecessary as there is a limestone quarry adjacent to the proposed site. Open to abuse as there is no monitoring of the 'rubbish' that may end up being dumped in a pit rather than properly (and more expensively) disposed of.</p>	
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>A programme of construction reinstatement and habitat creation will commence during the construction phase. The above statement is a contradiction in terms, the construction machinery and the work being carried out will be disruptive and will have an adverse effect on wildlife, surely 'during' should be 'after' and further specific detail is required</p>	<p>Measures for preparing and maintaining the Site, such as keeping machinery and dust-generating activities away from receptors, implementing dust suppression or containment measures, maintaining clean fencing and barriers, promptly remove or cover dust-producing materials, and cover, seed, or fence stockpiles to prevent wind dispersion is secured in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Regarding agricultural land remediation, the document states the land will return to agricultural use at the end of the 40 year period, will the ES confirm that if the development is approved all of the concrete bases, foundations, piles and all other sub-structure elements are grubbed up, crushed and recycled on site into aggregate and then removed for future</p>	<p>The <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>, secures that source segregated aggregate material arising from demolition activities, such as crushed brick and concrete, to be reused on the Site of production within</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>construction use, also where necessary replacing any topsoils with a similar heathland soil where required?                      If this land is not properly restored it will not be able to be farmed in a conventional manner, unable to be cultivated or harvested due to the potential damage to farm machinery. Wild grasses and weeds will grow, and it will look something like the old Butlins Filey holiday camp site does today. I like to see wildflowers growing but not 4,200 acres of them, when this best and most versatile land should be growing food crops.</p>	<p>earthworks projects or as sub-base or drainage materials.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>At the moment solar panels at the end of their usable life are finding their way into landfill in Africa. As far as we know there is no recycling facility in the UK. The West's relationship going forward with China is uncertain. Springwell should fully address these matters at this pre-planning stage. The Lincoln Heath is a very fragile part of our county.</p>	<p>Recycling at end of life for all materials and components associated with Springwell Solar Farm was largely based on publicly available data from disposal scenarios available in the Environmental Product Declarations used. All Environmental Product Declarations used can be found in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.1: Raw data and emissions factors [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b></p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>The heathland soils are light in nature with an element of limestone particles within the growing medium, very free draining to the limestone brash subsoils which continue down to the water bearing strata which is the Central Lincolnshire aquifer which provides drinking water to many hundreds of thousands of homes.                      The villages of Scopwick and Kirkby Green have been adversely affected by flooding particularly during periods of high rainfall with an increasing incidence in recent years. The problems created by old and poorly maintained surface water drainage and sewerage systems may be exacerbated by the hard landscaping and the solar panels themselves.</p>	<p>The <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b> has assessed all the sources of flooding as part of the assessment including a review of surface water flood risk, groundwater flood information and sewers.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>This should be investigated at an early stage in assessing the suitability of the land for solar panels.</p>	
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>The natural aquifer which is a unique feature of the Lincolnshire Heath and feeds the many springs and streams which occur along the site of the proposed solar development should be assessed and protected. The risks of pollution need to be assessed and monitored. In particular those associated with known risks of harmful chemicals from solar panels and battery installations</p>	<p>Procedures to mitigate against erosion, prevent disturbance of contamination, and emergency procedures to manage accidental spillages and leaks in order to minimise any risk to the soil and groundwater is secured in the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.7]</b>, the <b>Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.10]</b> and in the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>The area is home to many protected species well adapted to the current landscape of open farmland and small woodlands. A full protected species survey should be carried out before construction begins and the habitats protected from development. The area is home to the wild brown hare whose numbers have declined rapidly in recent years due to habitat loss. They are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and listed as a priority species under the UK post 2010 Biodiversity Framework. The area is also an important habitat for birds of prey including the red kite, buzzard, and barn owl. The number of barn owls is declining, and this native bird was placed on the Red List of Birds of Conservation Concern (2021). Similarly, the area has important populations of ground nesting birds namely skylarks and lapwings, both species named on the Red List as numbers have been subject to recent dramatic decline. Other animals reported in the area and protected by law include bats, hazel dormice,</p>	<p>The baseline desk studies and ecology surveys carried out to inform the ES are detailed within <b>ES Volume 3, Appendices 7.2-7.14 [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>. and are discussed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The biodiversity design has evolved, following the mitigation hierarchy, to avoid impact to species and habitats, where possible, and to create and enhance habitats. Details of habitat creation and enhancement proposals are in the <b>Outline</b></p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>slow-worms and badgers. The area is also home to several populations of deer, whose populations range over fields threatened with being fenced off and covered with solar panels. At a time when the UK has been assessed as one of the most ecologically impoverished countries in the world, it is proposed to take large areas of open countryside and valuable wildlife habitat for industrial use.</p>	<p><b>Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.9].</b></p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Health of those living and working in the area should be considered particularly the effects on mental health. The pandemic highlighted the importance of being out in nature for our mental health. The considerable disruption of construction over many months together with the industrialisation of the landscape with high metal fencing, closely packed solar panels, lighting, CCTV and 3.5m high solar stations housing transformers on this vast scale will necessarily have a negative impact on mental health in an area which is used for both residential and recreational purposes.</p>	<p>The CCTV system will be positioned away from any footpaths and sensitive receptors.</p> <p>The visual effect of security fencing has been taken into account in <b>ES Volume1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1].</b></p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Commissioning RSK to prepare the EIA. RSK are not an independent body. They have a biased towards these projects as their ultimate parent company invest in these projects. We should be pushing for a truly independent body. This should be clearly highlighted as a major concern by the PC. RSK are owned by a major US private Equity firm called Ares who are directly involved in the Green Energy Market.</p>	<p>RSK is not owned by Ares. RSK is a privately held, employee-owned business.</p> <p>RSK is held to the same high standards of professionalism as all Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) consultants, including through its registration with the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) EIA Quality Mark. The scheme includes independent review of RSKs EIA work as well as its delivery against seven 'EIA commitments'.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	<p>RSK looking to take certain things out of scope in the EIA? This seems to be a common strategy by solar factory developers. Similar strategy was deployed by Mallard Pass developers. We should strongly object. The following should not be taken out of scope - 5.2 (Glint &amp; Glare), 5.3 (Heat &amp; Radiation), 5.4 (Major accidents and disaster), 5.5 (Utilities), 5.6 (Human health), 5.7 (Material assets and waste), 5.8 (population) and 5.9 (Water).</p>	<p>The ES identifies a range of possible impacts of the Proposed Development, including both beneficial and adverse, together with mitigation measures to maximise beneficial effects and prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset adverse effects.</p> <p>The scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), including environmental factors to be scoped in/out, has been determined by the EIA Scoping Opinion received from PINS. <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.3: Scoping Opinion Response Matrix [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b> presents the responses received via the Scoping Opinion and the Applicant's responses to each matter raised. The EIA Regulations require the Environmental Statement to be based on the scoping opinion. In instances where the assessment has not been based on the scoping opinion, this has been agreed with the relevant statutory consultee and is detailed along with the associated justification within the Section 4: Approach to the assessment of <b>ES Volume 1, Chapters 6 – 15 [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>

**Statutory  
Consultee**

**Comments**

**Applicant's response**

The Planning Inspectorate has agreed (via the Scoping Opinion) that the following environmental factors/other environmental considerations can be scoped out of the assessment as no significant effects are anticipated: glint and glare; heat and radiation; major accidents and disasters; utilities, human health, material assets and waste; and electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields. Justification for this agreement, and the approach taken, is presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA [EN010149/APP/6.1]**.

Whilst the Planning Inspectorate has agreed that these environmental factors can be scoped out of the assessment as part of the EIA of likely significant effects, the following assessments have been undertaken for completeness: **ES Volume 3, Appendix 5.4: Glint and Glare Study [EN010149/APP/6.3]**; **BESS Plume Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.19]**; and **ES Volume 2, Figure 5.1: Desk-based Study of Existing Utilities [EN010149/APP/6.2]**.

Any relevant mitigations has been secured in the **Outline Construction**

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	They reference a document known as LA 112. LA 112 is not relevant they need to reconsider - LA112 is for transport projects this isn't a transport project (Design Manual for Roads & Bridges) There are major impacts to all the groups above as highlighted by the 95% who voted against this project in the last Parish meeting	<b>Environmental Management Plan [EN101049/APP/7.7] and Outline Operation Environmental Management Plan [EN101049/APP/7.10].</b>  It is recognised that DMRB LA112 is used for road schemes. However, as there is no statutory guidance for assessing the significance of effects relating to population, DMRB LA 112 gives a recognised basis for undertaking an assessment and determining the likely significance of any effects. The criteria used in this assessment has then been amended to encompass any receptors that DMRB LA 112 does not consider to then give a comprehensive assessment method.
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	They see no impact on our properties	An assessment of residential visual amenity has been undertaken for numerous properties within and in close proximity to the Site and this has informed the development of the design. The full details of the assessment is included within ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1] and further detail on the principles that have informed the design and how the design has developed is set out within the <b>Design</b>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>They want this out of scope, they miss the point we live in this area for the outstanding natural beauty</p>	<p><b>Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3].</b></p> <p>An assessment of residential visual amenity has been undertaken for numerous properties within and in close proximity to the Site and this has informed the development of the design. The full details of the assessment is included within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and further detail on the principles that have informed the design and how the design has developed is set out within the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3].</b></p> <p>The design has sought to avoid, reduce and offset environmental effects and as part of the Proposed Development and has removed areas of Solar PV development and increase offsets alongside proposals for incorporating green infrastructure including planting of hedgerows, trees and grassland which would be undertaken to reduce visual effects.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>How can they position this as out of scope when they are taking 4200 acres of Best Most Valuable farmland out of production.</p>	<p>The Applicant has sought to minimise impacts on BMV land and preferably use land in areas of poorer quality except where this would be inconsistent with other</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>sustainability considerations. This has influenced both the initial site selection process and the subsequent design evolution of the Proposed Development. Fields comprising of solely Grade 1 or 2 land within the Site will remain available for arable production.</p> <p>A considered assessment of the soil, agricultural land and management of soil resources is provided in <b>Section 11.9 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 11: Land, Soil and Groundwater [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and measures to protect BMV land and soil is detailed in the <b>Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010149/APP7.11]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Walkers Cyclists &amp; Horse Riders                  They see no impact and indicate this should be out of scope. For all of these groups the significant change to the landscape will have a material impact.                  We are meant to be promoting health and wellbeing and the countryside is a key element of this</p>	<p>Visual effects on users of PROWs are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and an assessment on Population which includes an assessment of walkers, cyclists and horse riders in detailed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>These areas are going to be covered in concrete to create hard standing platforms. This along with piling to create footings for the panels this land will never be used again for farming. What cast iron assurances will there be that ever piece of concrete will be removed from the land?</p>	<p>During the decommissioning phase, it is assumed that all concrete, hardstanding areas, foundations for the infrastructure and any internal tracks will be removed to</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>a depth of up to 1m. It is assumed that all the below ground cables will be left in situ. Further detail is included within the <b>Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.13]</b>.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>The CCTV is a gross intrusion into our human rights with security tracking our right to roam freely in the countryside.</p>	<p>The CCTV system will be directed away from any footpaths and sensitive receptors.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>These have been in place for many years and were originally scoped by [REDACTED], these included 4 promoted walks. These walks will be fundamentally changed and spoilt. At a time when we are focussed so much on people's mental wellbeing this will have a significant detrimental impact</p>	<p>The applicant has sought to offset Solar PV development from PRow and include visual breaks, particularly in Springwell East. Visual effects on users of PRow are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>
		<p>There would be no permanent closures of Public Rights of Way during the operation of the Proposed Development. Temporary closures would be required during the construction phase which will be managed by the principles set out in the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b>.</p> <p>The Proposed Development includes proposals to enhance the existing PRow</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	There are a significant number of Listed Heritage sites across the planned site. These sites will all have their outlooks spoilt by the development	<p>network, as detailed in <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 2-6: Access Parameter Plan [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p>All heritage assets within 2km and all designated heritage assets within 5km have been included in <b>ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]</b>.</p> <p>Those sensitive to changes in their setting have informed the masterplan of the Proposed Development and have been filtered for further assessment based on a worst case ZTV.</p>
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	There is already increased risk of flooding in the Scopwick area. The document 5.9.23 references Cook & McQueen (2013) when discussing runoff and potential impacts on flooding. This was a modelled classroom study on a tiny scale. It did demonstrate a small increase. They cannot seriously be using a classroom-based study to take Water out of scope. The potential change to drainage on a site this large could be significant.	To address flood risk, an Outline Drainage Strategy has been prepared and is included as an appendix to the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> (which forms an appendix to the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b> ). This strategy confirms that the Proposed Development will not increase surface water runoff rates. Measures to manage drainage have been carefully designed to ensure that local flood risk will not worsen, particularly for nearby areas such as Scopwick and Kirkby Green, where historical drainage issues are noted.

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	Use of borrow pits. Can the planning inspectorate guarantee that these sites won't be filled with construction contaminates and then back filled. Ref 5.7 materials, assets & waste	<p>The design includes sustainable drainage measures to prevent additional strain on existing drainage systems and ensure that no increase in offsite flood risk occurs due to the solar panels or associated infrastructure. Further details on the flood risk and drainage management approach can be found in the <b>Flood Risk Assessment [EN010149/APP/7.16]</b>.</p> <p>No borrow pits are proposed as part of the Proposed Development.</p>
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	Why has no alternative site or source of power generation been considered.	<p>A summary of alternatives has been included within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>Alternative types of renewable energy generation technologies, such as wind and hydrogen, were not considered by the Applicant. The Site is not considered to be well suited for onshore wind energy generation due to the low, flat topography of the local area, which would likely give rise to significant landscape and visual effects due to the height of the turbines</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	<p><u>Climate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Panels shipped from China</li><li>• Concrete on the Land</li><li>• Alteration of Drainage</li><li>• Removal of Best most valuable farmland out of production resulting in increase in import and the associated carbon footprint</li></ul>	<p>Further detail is presented in the <b>Site Selection Report Appendix 1</b> of the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b>.</p> <p>The full lifecycle assessment presented in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> takes into account the emissions associated with the manufacture and transport of materials and components from source countries (including China as a part of Asia) and displays those emissions in tCO<sub>2</sub>e. The GHG savings of the Proposed Development outweigh the emissions associated with its construction, operation (including maintenance and replacement), and decommissioning, resulting in net GHG savings of over 9.6 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e.</p> <p>An assessment of alternatives for the Proposed Development is covered in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The Applicant has considered reasonable alternatives, with regard to all relevant issues, including the BMV value of the land.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	How can they look to make utilities out of SCOPE There is a significant risk with the Exolum Pipeline that crosses the Blankney estate. This pipeline is a critical piece of infrastructure and needs to be accessed at any time	We are aware of the Exolum Pipeline and are engaging with the relevant consultees to ensure that there are sufficient offset distances from works associated with the Proposed Development.
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	Whilst during the construction phase there may be a few extra hotel/B&B rooms rented out the longer-term cost will be much higher as potential tourist will avoid the areas and the impact on property could be devastating.	The Applicant has assessed impacts to local occupancy rates, tourism and employment as a result of the Proposed Development in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> . The assessment concludes that the maximum potential number of staff requiring overnight accommodation as a result of the Proposed Development is 6% of the peak number of construction workers onsite. This equates to a maximum number of 39 staff from outside the region who will need to utilise local infrastructure. The assessment concludes that there will be no significant effects on occupancy and therefore, the presence of construction staff will not place additional pressure on existing infrastructure.
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	Public rights of way. Temporary diversions potentially lasting two years will substantially impact the community's freedom of the community to walk the local countryside with adverse consequences to their health and well-being.	Any temporary diversions will be minimised where possible and would be up to a duration of 6 months during the construction phase. Temporary closures would be required during the construction phase which will be managed by the

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	It is not clear whether all the current footpaths and permitted paths are covered in the text. This facility is enjoyed and valued not only by the parish but also by the surrounding wider community in the district. A reduction to any of these will impact all communities' freedom of the community to walk the local countryside with adverse consequences to their health and well-being.	<p>principles set out in the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b>.</p> <p>Visual effects on users of PROWs are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>There would be no permanent closures of Public Rights of Way during the operation of the Proposed Development. Temporary closures would be required during the construction phase which will be managed by the principles set out in the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010149/APP/7.12]</b>.</p> <p>The Proposed Development includes proposals to enhance the existing PROW network, as detailed in <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 2-6: Access Parameter Plan [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>.</p>
<b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b>	As any potential human health impacts will be captured by the aforementioned assessments and there are not expected to be any significant human health impacts outside of these assessments, it is proposed that human health is not subject to dedicated assessment and therefore excluded from the scope of the EIA.	Potential health impacts, including mental health impacts during construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning and references where these impacts are assessed within the



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>Observation. The above observations fundamentally challenge the Report's assertion that "human health is not subject to dedicated assessment and therefore excluded from the scope of the EIA."</p>	<p>Environmental Statement (ES) are detailed in <b>Table 5.2 of ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> and is summarised below.</p> <p>The potential for impacts relating to health have been assessed across various environmental chapters within the ES. Therefore, where an environmental assessment has concluded there are unlikely to be significant environmental impacts; it therefore follows that there will be no impacts to human health (which includes physical health, mental health and wellbeing). No significant impacts to health are anticipated.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>As no significant effects are expected in relation to private property and housing, it is proposed that these matters be scoped out of further assessment.</p> <p>Observation. The changes to the local environment arising from the proposed development will very inevitably impact the value of public and private residential property and housing in the area. This is a factor that should not be excluded from the EIA assessment</p>	<p>The Applicant has sought to minimise likely significant effects and in particular visual effects and amenity in relation to properties in closest proximity to or within the Proposed Development. The approach to limiting visual effects is reported in the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b> and <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>5.8.9. As no significant effects are expected in relation to community land and assets, it is proposed that these matters be scoped out of further assessment.</p> <p>Observation. The community benefits from its current environment as a rural agricultural area which the proposed development as a mega-sized industrial plant will fundamentally impact. Therefore, this should not be scoped out of the EIA assessment</p>	<p>The Applicant intends to promote economic benefits for the community as detailed in the activities outlined in the <b>Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010149/APP/7.20]</b>. The Plan describes activities that would promote access to employment, upskilling and re-skilling opportunities for local people.</p> <p>These could include work experience placements, access to jobs - from entry-level to skilled positions - and joint Apprenticeships across industry partners. Training and upskilling opportunities would be provided both for new entrants to the construction and renewable industry sectors and those seeking in-work progression. The Plan includes provision not only for opening up access to employment and skills opportunities on the solar energy farm site, but also within the Applicant organisations, including Apprenticeships and Graduate Entry positions. The Plan suggests that a process could be introduced whereby residents closest to the site are targeted, as a priority, for proactive awareness raising and recruitment drives.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>There are no other businesses present within the (development) Site boundary. There is no land allocated for employment use, nor are there any planning applications yet to be determined that will generate employment opportunities at the Site. Therefore, this should not be scoped out of the EIA assessment.</p> <p>While at present there are no other businesses, land allocated for business use, or planning applications for such within the Site, there nevertheless is the possibility that such, say as small cooperative agricultural holdings or business enterprises being generated any time in future as an alternative to the proposed development. Therefore, these should not be scoped out of the EIA assessment</p>	<p>The Plan includes provision for working with schools to promote the career opportunities available to young people within renewable industries, including, importantly, those available local to their place or residence. This would support the objective, shared by regional and local stakeholders, to encourage young people to invest their careers and futures within Lincolnshire rather than seek opportunities in other parts of the UK.</p> <p>The Applicant intends to promote economic benefits for the community as detailed in the activities outlined in the <b>Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan [EN010149/APP/7.20]</b>. The Plan describes activities that would promote access to employment, upskilling and re-skilling opportunities for local people.</p> <p>These could include work experience placements, access to jobs - from entry-level to skilled positions - and joint Apprenticeships across industry partners. Training and upskilling opportunities would be provided both for new entrants to the construction and renewable industry sectors and those seeking in-work</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
		<p>progression. The Plan includes provision not only for opening up access to employment and skills opportunities on the solar energy farm site, but also within the Applicant organisations, including Apprenticeships and Graduate Entry positions. The Plan suggests that a process could be introduced whereby residents closest to the site are targeted, as a priority, for proactive awareness raising and recruitment drives.</p> <p>The Plan includes provision for working with schools to promote the career opportunities available to young people within renewable industries, including, importantly, those available local to their place or residence. This would support the objective, shared by regional and local stakeholders, to encourage young people to invest their careers and futures within Lincolnshire rather than seek opportunities in other parts of the UK.</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>As the PRWC will minimise any potential impacts to walkers, cyclists and horse riders during the construction phase and no significant permanent effects are expected in relation to walkers, cyclists and horse riders during the operational phase of the Proposed Development, it is proposed that these matters be scoped out of further assessment.</p>	<p>Visual effects on users of PROWs are addressed in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>. The assessment acknowledges that there would be some</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>Observation. As with 5.63 and 64 it is not clear whether all the current footpaths and permitted paths are covered in the text. This facility is enjoyed and valued not only by the parish but also by the surrounding wider community in the district. A reduction to any of these will negatively impact health and well-being</p>	<p>significant visual effects on certain public rights of way, particularly during construction and in the early years of operation. Following Phase 2 consultation, further details have been provided on the mitigation proposals, specifically the proposed green infrastructure, which is illustrated in <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 3.3 Green Infrastructure Parameters Plan [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>. Following establishment, there would remain some significant effects on visual amenity, but these would be much reduced in terms of both scale and geographic extent</p>
<p><b>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</b></p>	<p>As no significant effects to population are expected across any of the five matters detailed in LA 112, it is proposed to exclude population from the scope of the EIA. However, socio-economic benefits as a result of the Proposed Development are expected with regards to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in the level of temporary employment;</li> <li>• The subsequent gross value added to the economy;</li> <li>• Uptake in the occupancy rate for beds in local hospitality venues; and</li> <li>• A small number of long-term employment opportunities during operation.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, a Socio-Economic Benefits Statement will be submitted in support of the DCO Application, highlighting the positive socio-economic impacts of the Proposed Development on the local and regional area. This statement will be produced outside of the EIA process and thus to avoid any potential for confusion or repetition, the Applicant does not consider it necessary to consider socio-economic impacts in an EIA context as well.</p>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 13: Population [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> has considered the potential impacts to health as a result of a change in the level of employment. During the construction phase there will be an increase in the level of employment available for local people in the construction sector and the associated supporting industries which is beneficial and significant. During operation there will be a small number of operational jobs created which is beneficial but not considered to be significant. As such there is likely to be a long term benefits to the</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>Observation. The preceding observations demonstrate that the conclusions set out above are flawed in that the EIA proposes scoping out many factors of significance which will invalidate its very purpose. The missing factors should be made to be part of this EIA exercise</p>	<p>area through the number of jobs created. Holding employment is one element that contributes towards a person's health status.</p>
<p><b>West Lindsey District Council</b></p>		
<p><b>West Lindsey District Council</b></p>	<p>Planning Policy Context: The site is a good distance (approximately 8.8 miles) outside the closest West Lindsey District boundary near Cherry Willingham. The statutory development plan for the purposes of S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 is the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036. It is expected that the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review will be adopted on 13th April 2023 following examination and acceptance of all modifications recommended by the examining inspector. This would then have full weight as part of the Development Plan. As the district of West Lindsey is part of Central Lincolnshire its statutory development is also the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012- 2036, soon to be Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review. The Environmental Statement should consider National Planning Policy and Guidance as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);</li> <li>- National Planning Practice Guidance (to include):</li> <li>- Climate Change</li> <li>- Historic Environment</li> <li>- Environmental Impact Assessment</li> <li>- Air Quality [REDACTED] 5th April 2023 Page 2 of 3</li> <li>- Light Pollution</li> <li>- Healthy and Safe Communities</li> <li>- Natural Environment</li> <li>- Noise</li> <li>- Renewable and Low Carbon Energy</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The Proposed Development has been assessed in accordance with the relevant policies and is part of the individual Environmental Statement chapters and is assessed within the <b>Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]</b> submitted in support of the Development Consent Order Application.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements in Decision-taking</li> <li>- Water Supply, Wastewater and Water Quality</li> <li>- National Design Guide 2019</li> <li>- National Design Model Code 2012</li> <li>- Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)* - Overarching National Policy Statement on Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)*</li> </ul> <p>* Currently under review by Central Government</p>	
<p><b>West Lindsey District Council</b></p>	<p>As set out in the SR the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should follow the guidance of the Landscape Institute “Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition (2013), as proposed. An iterative approach, which guides the layout and scheme design should be followed.</p> <p>The location of the proposed Solar Park would be approximately 8.8 miles (14.3 kilometres) to 12.3 miles (19.9 kilometres) from the shared North Kesteven and West Lindsey district boundary. The height of the development (including infrastructure) would primarily be no more than around 6 metres high, however paragraph 2.4.43 of the SR states that “The National Grid Substation compound would have an approximate footprint of 500m x 500m in plan, and up to 15m in height. The majority of the infrastructure would be up to 6m in height; however, the steel gantries are assumed to be up to 15m in height”. The SR in paragraph 2.4.39 assumes that the National Grid Substation would be on the site. It is requested that more clarity and certainty is provided in the ES statement in terms of the location and appearance of the National Grid Substation which would have structures up to 15 metres in height.</p> <p>Given the height of the development subject to the location of the 15 metre high unit it would either not be expected to be in view from any parts of the West Lindsey District or if in view would not be expected to have an</p>	<p>Noted. <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> has been prepared in accordance with the guidance noted.</p> <p>The National Grid Navenby Substation is no longer part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Height of each element of the Proposed Development is outlined in <b>ES Volume 2, Figure 3.2: Height Parameters [EN010149/APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has been informed by technical landscape and visual analysis. The landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development are set out in detail in <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN10149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>unacceptable harmful visual impact on the West Lindsey District. Therefore, it is not considered likely that any viewpoints from West Lindsey would be necessary and no residential properties in West Lindsey are expected to be affected.</p>	<p>Mitigations are being proposed to minimise the visual impacts such as screening and minimising the height of equipment wherever practicable. An earth bund is proposed to the east of Springwell Substation and BESS to support screening and integration of the Proposed Development and reduce potential impacts on residential properties and users of the A15. Further detail can be found in the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010149/APP/7.3]</b>.</p>
<p><b>West Lindsey District Council</b></p>	<p>West Lindsey which is part of Central Lincolnshire, with North Kesteven District Council and Lincoln City Council, and is expecting four large scale solar projects (nationally significant infrastructure) to be applied for through a Development Consent Order in addition to Springwell Solar Farm. These are (with update):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 600MW Cottam Solar Project Proposed across 3 sites on land (1270Ha) in proximity of Sturton by Stow and Willingham by Stow, Corringham and Blyton. The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) confirmed on 9th February that this project has been accepted for examination.</li> <li>- 500MW Gate Burton Solar Project The development is proposed on a 684Ha site to the south of Gainsborough/Lea. It was accepted for examination on 22nd February,</li> <li>- 480MW West Burton Solar Project Proposed across 3 sites (788Ha) on land to the south of Sturton by Stow. The Planning Inspectorate have advised they received an application for a Development Consent Order on 21st March. They will make a decision on whether to accept the application for examination, by 18th April.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effect [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b> sets out the Cumulative effects, methodology for carrying out the assessing and Zone of Influence for each Environmental Factor. This is an assessment is based on publicly available information at the time.</p> <p>Further consultation with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council to agree the final short list for inclusion in the Environmental Statement has been undertaken. Details of consultation held to date are included within <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 16: Cumulative Effect [EN010149/APP/6.1]</b>.</p>



Statutory Consultee	Comments	Applicant's response
	<p>- 500MW Tillbridge Solar Project 1400Ha site on land between Corringham and Glentworth. It is anticipated by PINS, that the developer will submit their application in Q4 2023. Before that, the developer will be required to advertise and undertake public consultation, which is anticipated they will hold around May/June 2023.</p> <p>Whilst the structure of the ES appears to be generally acceptable it is imperative that any Environmental Impact Assessment clearly considers within its structure the cumulative effect of Springwell Solar Farm with these other solar farm projects and any other solar Farms in Central Lincolnshire such as the Fiskerton Solar project, which is an extant development, with consent to expand. There are questions as to how all these developments taken together will affect Central Lincolnshire's character, as traditional rural Lincolnshire Countryside.</p>	



[springwellsolarfarm.co.uk](http://springwellsolarfarm.co.uk)